

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

Call. No. _____

Acc. No. _____

D.G.A. 79

GIPN—S1—2D. G. Arch. N. D./57—25-2-58—1,00,000

11. 11. 11.
11. 11. 11.
11. 11. 11.

HISTORY OF INDIA

1857—1916

46567

By

O. P. SINGH BHATIA, M.A.

author of

History of India (1707-1858), The Imperial Guptas, Ranjit Singh and
his successors, England since Glorious Revolution, Hindu
Period, Delhi Sultanate, Mughal Period, India
upto 1526 and India under the
Musalmans.

foreword by

Shri D. C. DAS I.C.S.

Secretary to the Govt. of India

954.084

Bhatia

AND

A letter of appreciation by

Dr. ZAKIR HUSAIN

President of India



S. AMARDEEP PUBLISHERS

F-20, Nauroji Nagar, New Delhi-16 (INDIA)

Published by :

S. DARSHAN

For Amardeep Publishers

F-20, Nauroji Nagar, New Delhi-16.

© O. P. Singh Bhatia 1965

Price : Rs. 15/-

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL

LIBRARY : NEW DELHI.

Acc No. 46527

17.4.1968

Call No. 954.084 / Pcha



उपराष्ट्रपति, भारत
नई देहली
VICE-PRESIDENT
INDIA
NEW DELHI

29 April, 1965.

Dear Shri Bhatia,

I have read your book "History of India 1857-1916" with great interest. I think your approach is objective and your statements are balanced, and I trust the book will be of benefit to a large number of readers.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(Zakir Husain)

Shri O. P. Singh Bhatia
NEW DELHI.

D. C. DAS, I.C.S.,

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
FOR
SOCIAL WELFARE

New Delhi, Dated 29th November, 1966

FOREWORD

As one who has had the good fortune of learning history at the feet of masters like Harold Laski and Hearnshaw I was naturally interested in Shri O. P. Singh Bhatia's interpretation of the modern period of Indian history. The art of writing history has developed through endless stages of pictorial representations on stones, recitation of legends, composition of chronicles, memoirs, inscriptions, conscious efforts at recording events for the delight of patrons or dedication to posterity etc. The process has probably reached a fairly final stage in modern times with all the facilities for record and its transmission all over the world. Nothing short of a cosmic crisis can possibly wipe off human history any more.

In the field of writing history the emphasis has therefore shifted from recording to interpreting the facts. The manner of presentation of facts and of getting the essence out of them has assumed importance. It is in this area that Shri Singh Bhatia's work has special significance, particularly when we bear in mind the fact that the history of India between 1857 and 1916, while giving birth to a new era in the country, proved to be momentous as well as tumultuous.

There are three characteristic features of the book which stand out and vouch for its usefulness. First is the interesting and novel way in which the romantic episode of the uprising of 1857 has been dealt with. The author has tried to give a connected account of the events from a dispassionate angle and assess its results. It is distinct from other similar accounts in as much as it represents a non-political and an impartial point of view. Second is the detailed account of the achievements of and works done by the British Viceroys. The

trend now-a-days is to ignore the periods of viceroyalty and give a continuous account of the events. The result is that the personalities of the viceroys, who much more than Whitehall directly and effectively gave shape to the trends of administration of an Empire and were the main architects of the British Empire in India, are ignored in the process. This book is particularly useful as the author has delineated the personalities of the Viceroys and their impact upon the events in the country, which threw up novel and original challenges to test their capabilities. Thirdly, the author has introduced a new approach in presenting an account of the history of the growth of Indian nationalism. Being a student of history and not a preacher of doctrine or exponent of political theories he has approached the matter from both economic and social points of view from a strictly non-partisan plane. Presenting the political developments in this field in this manner does great credit to the author.

I have no hesitation in feeling convinced that this work will be very useful to and much admired by advanced students of Indian history and other serious readers who seek the truth and appreciate an impartial approach.

Sd. DEBESH DAS

President

All India Bengal Literary Conference

PREFACE

This book is a sequel to its companion volume entitled 'History of India (1707-1856)'. I have tried to make it as useful and self-contained as the first book. However, my labour in writing this book has been lightened because well-sorted out material on the history of this period is already available. The main trends which emerge as a result of an analysis of the history of this period are not so well-defined since they relate to a very recent period. The impact of various aspects of the British policy are not perceptible even now. Sympathies for and the influences of the British rule cannot yet be evaluated dispassionately. I have, therefore, tried to steer clear of this fog of uncertainty and given an analysis of the events as they occurred. I have tried to highlight the main threads of the British policy and their outstanding results. The main thing, however, on which I have tried to focus attention is the contribution of the British Viceroys of this period which is considerable but whose significance is often totally submerged by the much more important event—the nascent nationalism. For this reason, I have dealt with the story of the growth of Indian Nationalism in a separate self-contained chapter. There can be no two opinions about the supreme importance of the nationalist movement in India in the context of the modern circumstances and, therefore, cannot be given less importance than the contribution of the British to the making of Modern India. And, this is the characteristic which makes this book different from other similar volumes.

I am very grateful to my colleagues, Shri Indar Nath, who lent me his ungrudging assistance in the preparation of this volume, Shri H.N.D. Gandhi, who besides offering assistance at various stages also prepared the index for this book and Shri Shamlal, the printer, who took up this work at a short notice and completed it in a record time of two weeks only.

I must also express my sincere thanks to our revered President Dr. Zakir Husain, who spared time from his busy schedule, to go through this book and write a letter of appreciation.

Last but not least, I am thankful to Shri D.C. Das, I.C.S. Secretary, Government of India, for favouring me with a foreword to this book.

O. P. SINGH BHATIA

F. 20, Nauroji Nagar,
New Delhi-16.
20th January, 1968.

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of Appreciation 	i
Foreword 	iii
Preface 	v
Introduction 	1
Rising of 1857 	3
British Viceroys in India (1857-1916) ...	20
Anglo-Afghan Relations 	128
Indian Nationalism 	143
Bibliography 	173
Index 	175

INTRODUCTION

THE English came to India as traders and throughout their stay in this sub-continent all their actions and activities were affected by their commercial motive. Their policy, whether political or social, was influenced by this basic characteristic and anything that went against this principle was opposed vehemently in the beginning. No major social or political reform was undertaken before 1856 by the English. In fact the British rule was purely that of a conqueror, keeping the conquered under its heel. Railways were constructed, telegraph services were introduced, postal system was inaugurated and so many other amenities of modern life were made available to the Indians, apparently as boons of the condescending conqueror. In reality, however, all these services were designed to subserve the colonial and commercial objectives of the British Rule. Railways would enable them to move the armed forces quickly to the trouble-spots. The improved communications would link various strategic posts with the headquarters and enable it to control the administration better. All this in turn would tighten the halter round the necks of the subjugated people. The course of events of the rising of 1857 go to prove the importance and use of the new amenities.

However, while conferring these boons upon the subject-people, the British had not visualised another result to which these could lead to. The better means of communications enabled the Indians to become travel-minded. Large number of people visited places which they would not have otherwise dreamt of seeing in their lives. Thus the people who spoke different languages, dressed differently, lived differently, met together and realised that they belonged to the same motherland. All this opened new vistas and broadened the mental outlook of the public. The people became proud of their country and for the first time there was a feeling of remorse in their hearts, tinged with sadness, that the country—their own motherland—was not their own. A yearning was ingrained in them to live a life free from the trammels of slavery imposed on them by the conqueror. But this new awakeniing, this sense of belonging to one nation, was not recognised by any body in its exact

form. It was a vague and nebulous idea, a dream which merely bewildered the people who could not define it.

It was in this bewildered state of mind that they rose against the conqueror, not as a united nation, not as an organised body, but merely like a man who jumps up from his sleep when disturbed by a startling dream. These were the half-asleep, half-awakened people who fought against the organised strength of the conqueror in 1857—and lost. Their defeat was quite logical but this defeat was in itself a success. It jolted the people out of their torpor and awakened them to the reality that it was futile for them to try to win back their freedom by violence. They would have to resort to constitutional means and get back their lost liberty bit by bit. The events of 1857 also opened the eyes of the Englishmen. They saw the new spirit of resurgence springing principally from their own innovations and flowing into the length and the breadth of the country. They became alert and tried their best to suppress the craving of the Indians for more and more self-government. But the new nationalism was insistent and derived its strength from their literature and history of the West. Already there were precedents before the Indians when the conquered countries had snatched their independence from the conquerors. To some extent, they emulated their methods. At times they failed but at times they also succeeded. Slowly, the Englishmen had to inch away their hold over the destiny of the Indian people. They stormed, fumed, cursed and fought the ground, but slowly and surely they had to give way and grudgingly yield concessions to the Indians. This trend was not so well-marked during the period covered by this book. But, later on, these trends became pronounced and the nascent spirit of nationalism gained strength, became organised as time passed, and brought forth new leaders and workers in the cause of the freedom of the country.

The political history of post-mutiny India (1857-1916) deals with this conflict of the two forces—one, the losing force of imperialism and second, the newly born resurgent spirit of nationalism. It makes an interesting study, particularly in the background of the pre-mutiny period, which recounts only the onrush of the political domination of the English over the prostrate India. The English had actually injected vitality into a debilitated giant so that they could make him a useful slave little knowing that he will break his shackles and assert his independence.

RISING OF 1857

HISTORIANS differ among themselves about the real character of the rising of 1857. European writers have called it only a mutiny of the sepoys. Indian authors, led by Vir Savarkar, describe it as the First War of Independence. In reality, it was neither purely a revolt of the Sepoys nor a freedom struggle of the nation for independence. It was something midway between the two. This is evident from the events of the rising as also from the personalities who came into prominence during this struggle. The contemporary records of the period, which were written mainly by the British writers are mostly prejudiced and present coloured accounts. They do give a complete picture of the events but they are not unbiased and faithful in regard to the analysis of those events. They describe the rising as merely a revolt of some disaffected soldiers who were joined by some disgruntled local rulers, having grievances against the British Government. On the other hand, according to some Indian historians, it was for the first time in our history that the common people joined hands with their leaders to make an effort to oust the foreigners from their native soil.

The British had come to India as traders. Taking advantage of the political instability and absence of an efficient central government here, they began to interest themselves in the political affairs of the country. By the time Warren Hastings left India, they had established themselves as an important element in the politics of India. Lord Wellesley planned the transformation of the British Empire in India into the British Empire of India by subjugating important native chiefs. He was largely successful in his object. By his system of Subsidiary Alliances, he converted the majority of Indian States into tributaries of the British Government, ruled by a British army maintained at their cost. From this period upto the arrival of Lord Dalhousie, the British followed what is known as "The Policy of Subordinate Isolation" towards native rulers who had acknowledged the British supremacy. The aim of the British Government during this period was to suppress every strong ruler without discouraging misgovernment in any of the native states. The

idea underlying this policy was that on the one hand it gained for the Government the popular sympathy of the people when they compared efficient administration in the British territories to the misrule in the native states. On the other it also provided the British with a pretext to annex the state to their Empire in due course on grounds of misgovernment. Lord Dalhousie's 'Doctrine of Lapse' brought under the pale of British Government all such States in the British Empire whose rulers failed to have a son in the direct line. The States of Jhansi, Nagpur, Satara, Jaitpur and Sambhalpur, one after the other, were annexed to the British Empire by Lord Dalhousie. Oudh was annexed on the pretext of maladministration. The British thought that by this policy they would earn the gratitude of the people who were groaning under the corrupt rule of the native ruler. Unfortunately, Lord Dalhousie did not get sufficient time to introduce a better system of government in the province, and, after his tenure of office, none else gave any special attention to Oudh. This indifferent attitude resulted in a widespread unrest as with the change of administration thousands of sepoys and civil servants were thrown out of employment in Oudh. The introduction of land reforms adversely affected many Talukdars. The introduction of new services like railways and telegraph system created many misunderstandings since orthodox people viewed these innovations with superstitious fear and contempt.

The attitude of the British towards the royal families of the States annexed through 'Doctrine of Lapse' was far from respectable. The furniture of palaces, jewelry and other articles of the royal family of Nagpur were auctioned in public without caring for the protest of the chief queen. The rulers of others States were also treated similarly and were not shown any sympathy. The British were equally callous and high-handed in their treatment of the last Mughal Emperor, Bahadur Shah II. Although he enjoyed much less powers and dignity than the earlier Mughals, he was still regarded as the object of respect and reverence by the people. After the defeat of Sindhia in the Second Maratha War, the British had taken over the custody of the Mughal Emperor, who, since the beginning of the nineteenth Century, was an Emperor only in name but had always asserted his independent status. When Lord Minto arrived in India, the Mughal Emperor sent him a Khilat indicating his supreme authority. But Lord Minto refused to accept it and told the

Mughal Emperor that the British Government had acknowledged him only as a nominal sovereign, and that in fact, his position was only a complimentary one. The Mughal Emperor, however, did not give up his claim and during the period of Lord Hastings again tried to assert his supreme position. He refused to meet a British officer on equal terms and expected to be shown a special reverence. After the British had crushed every opposition in India they turned their attention to wipe out this nominal sovereignty. They deprived the city of Delhi of its independent position and appointed their own administrator. In 1835 they removed the name of the Mughal Emperor from the coinage. They also gave up their earlier practice of prefacing their addresses with salutations to the Mughal Emperor. Later on, the Mughal Emperor was required to get the approval of the British even for naming his successors. Lord Ellenborough informed him that he could not nominate a successor and even hinted that the British Government wanted him and his family to vacate the Red Fort and the palaces. Lord Dalhousie declared in 1849 that the successor of Bahadur Shah II would not be allowed to use the title of Badshah and would be known only as Shah. Earlier, in Delhi capital punishment could not be given without the approval of the Mughal Emperor and in the city courts the Muslim Law was prevalent. These superfluous appendages of departed power and glory were done away with now. The Mughal Emperor felt so much offended by this change in the attitude of the British that he avoided a meeting with the then Governor General. He sent Raja Ram Mohan Roy to England to plead his case with the British Government but nothing came out of it. There is evidence to the fact that the Mughal Emperor sent a mission to Persia seeking its help against the British. Although nothing came out of it, yet it proves that the Mughal Emperor desired to shake off the British control. Bahadur Shah was hesitant to side with the rebels in the beginning in the rising of 1857 but ultimately he did so and became their rallying point. Not only did he agree to become their leader but also invited other chiefs all over the country to join the struggle.

The British also offended Nana Saheb, the heir of Peshwa Baji Rao II. Nana Saheb had represented to the British for the continuance of the pension sanctioned to Baji Rao II. His request was turned down. Therefore, he pleaded his case with the British

Government in England through Azam Ullah Khan but the latter could not succeed in his mission. The result was that Nana Saheb became an irreconcilable foe of the British. Several writers are of the opinion that Nana Saheb was one of the conspirators who had been busy for a long time in engineering a rising against the British authority. He is said to have visited several cantonments and developed contacts with the native officers of the various regiments. He is also stated to have conspired with various native rulers although it has not yet been possible to ascertain the exact impact of his actions and his influence with different chiefs. Nana Saheb stayed at Bithur near Kanpur and had very cordial relations with the British officers residing there. This has led some of writers to contradict the allegations of Nana Saheb's participation in the conspiracy against the British Government. These writers hold that Nana Saheb was devoid of the qualities of a great organiser or a military leader. He remained a friend of the British till the circumstances forced him to join rebels. Notwithstanding the controversy it is now proved beyond doubt that Nana Saheb played an important part in the rising of 1857. He was the leader of the rebels at Kanpur and had important lieutenants in Azam Ullah Khan and Tantia Tope. He was responsible for the murder of several hundred of Europeans and gave a lot of trouble to the British at Kanpur and the adjoining regions.

Rani Laxmi Bai of Jhansi was a great, if not the greatest, opponent of the British during the rising. Her adopted son was not allowed to become the ruler of Jhansi after the death of her husband. In the stormy days she played a very important role in Central India. She is stated to be one of the organisers of the rising of 1857. Some writers, however, hold that she was loyal to the British Government in the initial stages but was forced to join the rebels when, in spite of her loyalty, she was suspected of being a rebel and accused of taking part in the massacre of the British at Jhansi, although she had taken over the administration of the city in the name of the British Government only after the law and orders of the place had failed completely. It is strange that the British Government did not accuse Sindhia although the situation in his state was quite similar to that in Jhansi. Moreover, while Sindhia was at the helm of the affairs, the Rani only enjoyed a secondary position in the State. The fact that the Rani was loyal to the British becomes clear from her letters written

by her to the Commissioner of Jabalpur after she had assumed charge of the Government of Jhansi. Later, when Sir Hugh Rose invested Jhansi she became the leader of the rebels and fought with the spirit of a true warrior. Her valour won her the applause of even her enemies.

Besides these native chiefs, who took a prominent part in the rising of 1857 because of their personal grievances, there were several other selfless patriots who offered a tough resistance to the British. Maulvi Ahmed Ullah was one of them. He had no personal axe to grind and joined the movement with the sincere and patriotic motive of liberating India from the British yoke. He declared Jihad on the British and exhorted both the Muslims and the Hindus to join him in a war of independence against the British Government. In February, 1857, he was arrested at Faizabad, and imprisoned on the charge of preaching sedition. When the sepoys rose in revolt, he was liberated and became the leader of the rebels at Lucknow. He offered a very tough resistance to Havelock and Campbell and was considered to be the bravest of the rebel chiefs in Oudh. He fought several engagements and could not be defeated by any of the British generals. He went on to Rohilkhand to carry on his struggle against the British. Unfortunately, he met his tragic end at the hands of the ruler of Powain, whom he visited to persuade him to join the national cause. He has been complimented for his bravery even by the contemporary British writers. Malletson writes about him : "If a patriot is a man who plots and fights for the independence, wrongfully destroyed, of his native country, then most certainly the Maulvi was a true patriot. He has not stained his sword by assassination, he had connived at no murder ; he had fought manfully, honourably and stubbornly in the field against the strangers who had seized his country, and his memories are entitled to the respect of the brave and the true hearted of all nations." It is a tragedy that the Maulvi was killed at the hands of his fellow countrymen.

Tantia Tope was another leader of the rebels who organised a long guerilla warfare against the British. He defeated Windham at Kanpur but was vanquished by Sir Hugh Rose. Finding that he was not strong enough to meet the British in a pitched battle, he employed guerilla tactics and remained unsubdued for a long time. He met his tragic end due to the treachery of Man Singh, a friend, who betrayed him to the British when he was asleep.

Kanwar Singh of Jagdishpur was another rebel leader of note. He had been a friend of the British but was driven to revolt by the callous attitude of the Government. He became the leader of the rebels at Dinapur and gave the British a long tough fight till his death.

Azam Ullah, who had gone to England to plead for Nana Sahib, was another leader of the rebels. He had a thorough knowledge of the European politics and on his return to Kanpur he remained a right-hand man of Nana Sahib in his struggle against the British.

From the above narrative it would be clear that all the chiefs, who had been involved in the rising of 1857, opposed the British either due to a direct offence given to them by the British Government or in favour of a party which had been offended by the British. None of them had any experience of a long drawn out warfare. This weakness of the revolutionary leaders was perhaps the chief cause of their failure against the British forces.

However, much more important than these discontented and disgruntled chiefs were the native sepoy in the regiments all over northern India. These sepoys had many grievances against the British Government. Their salaries were very low. They were not treated at par with the British sepoys although they had been equally loyal and had never hesitated to lay down their lives for the British Government. Their promotions had been very slow and limited. The natives could not be promoted to senior posts in the army. They were not given any special remuneration for their meritorious service or for exceptional bravery or courage in a battle-field. They even did not get appreciation for their services. With the passage of time, their relations with their British Officers became strained owing to the latter's indifference. While a British officer of the eighteenth or the early part of the nineteenth century was fairly acquainted with the problems of the native sepoys working under him, a British Junior Commissioned Officer or even a Senior Officer, after the British had become indisputably supreme in India, seldom tried to sympathise with his subordinates or ascertain their difficulties. Rather he was indifferent towards the sepoys. This embittered the feelings of the sepoys towards their officers. When the British were ruling only over the three eastern provinces of India, a sepoy was entitled to a special allowance if he was posted in Oudh or in some adjoining territory. However, with the expansion of the British rule the sepoys could be posted in any far-flung corner of the Empire

without being paid any special allowance. In fact, the sepoy posted in Sind did demand a special allowance, as Sind had not so far formed a part of the British Empire. But the British Government adopted a very indifferent attitude and instead of giving them any satisfaction punished some of their leaders and dismissed the sepoy of a regiment. The sepoy felt disgusted at this attitude of the Government and silently nursed their grievances. By a new regulation the British Government declared that in future promotions to the native sepoy would be given by seniority rather than by merit. This took away the initiative of the ambitious sepoy, who had aimed at a career in the army through an exceptionally meritorious service. By the old regulations a native sepoy could not be forced to cross the sea. This was in line with the religious prejudice of the sepoy. However, by a new regulation it was declared that all the sepoy recruited thenceforth could be asked to serve abroad. It was resented by the sepoy because their religious prejudice against crossing the sea prevented them from sending their children to the army. The annexation of Oudh fanned the discontent still further. Many of the native regiments had drawn their sepoy from these territories. Whenever there was any trouble in their villages these sepoy could send representations through the British Resident at Oudh. It was considered a big privilege and had been a great temptation for the natives to join the British Army. After Oudh became a part of the British Empire, this temptation vanished. The development of postal system and the concession to the army personnel to correspond freely without any expense led to a great exchange of correspondence between the native sepoy of various regiments. The greater part of this correspondence related to various disabilities experienced by the sepoy at the hands of their officers. This served to generate a spirit of disloyalty particularly among the Bengal regiments posted all over northern India.

Unfortunately, at this time the Christian missionaries in India were greatly encouraged. Some of them even joined the army and tried to persuade the sepoy to embrace Christianity if they wanted rapid promotions. The sepoy, who valued their religion above all other things felt annoyed at this interference of the missionaries and began to suspect the intentions of the British Government. They were also incited by various dis-satisfied chiefs who visited them off and on and instilled in them a spirit of revolution against the British

Government. The number of the British soldiers as compared to that of the native sepoys was very small. The British Government was at this time involved in a war with Russia in Crimea which further drained the army of its European sepoys and officers. All over northern India there was only one British regiment at Lucknow. Places like Patna and Kanpur were without any appreciable European force. Against 40,000 Europeans there were about three lakhs and eleven thousand Indians employed in the British army and a number of strategic places all over northern India were controlled by the native regiments. Important arsenals were not properly guarded. The knowledge of the weak British position encouraged the natives to risk the odds against them.

The immediate cause of the rising of the sepoys was the greased cartridges issued to them. These were stated to contain the fat of hog and cow. The sepoys had to bite these cartridges before using them and plausibly considered their introduction as an attempt to interfere with their religion with a view to their ultimate conversion to Christianity. No British authority has so far contradicted this statement. Whether the introduction of these cartridges was intentional or accidental the mischief was done and once the sepoys became aware of it, it was very hard to keep them in check. They refused to use these cartridges. At this moment the British did not adopt a straight-forward policy. The withdrawal of these cartridges in time and a general assurance that no attempt would be made to enforce them again would have pacified the sepoys. Unfortunately, this was not done. On the other hand, the regiments who refused to use the cartridges were disbanded.

The British Government had imposed several restrictions on the commerce of Indian goods which virtually brought the Indian commerce to a stand-still. The British commodities were given very favourable terms and the Indians were discouraged from the manufacture of such goods as could be imported from England. The cultivators and the land-owners both suffered miserably at the hands of the Britishers. Lord Cornwallis's Permanent Settlement of Bengal had created a class of landlords faithful to the British Government but it had sacrificed the interests of the poor ryots and had left them completely at the mercy of the landlords. The land reforms introduced by Lord William Bentinck hit the landowners hard. Some of the landowners had been exempted from the payment of the land

revenue as their ancestors had never paid it. Lord William Bentinck instituted an enquiry into the privileges of these landlords and all those persons who could not produce a legal deed to prove their cases, were asked to pay the revenue henceforth. Many of them represented that the privileges had been enjoyed by them for several generations in the past which was a sufficient proof of the legality of their rights. But all these protestation went in vain. The result was that these landlords turned hostile against the British Government. After the annexation of Oudh on the pretext of maladministration and of other states under the 'Doctrine of Lapse', the British Government instituted an enquiry into the title deeds of the landlords. The investigation was carried out very harshly and the landlords who could not submit legal documents in support of their claims in time were straight-away deprived of their land. Jackson, the Chief Settlement Commissioner of Oudh, became very unpopular by his speedy and strict measures against the Talukdars and Jagirdars of Oudh. This policy antagonised the landed aristocracy and Talukdars against the British Government. Malletson expressed regret for these measures and wrote, "Where Akbar had feared to tread, the English, guided by the rash hand of Thomasonian, had rushed in. The result was that throughout the districts over which he had ruled, in Jaunpur (Jaunpur) and Azamgarh, in Agra, Kanhpur (Kanpur) and the adjoining districts throughout Bundelkhand, there reigned a discontentment which lent itself very readily to the schemes of the major conspirators." Unfortunately, because of the Permanent Settlement, the British Government could not increase land revenue in Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. The expenses on administration, however, increased and to make up the deficit the Government greatly increased the land revenue in the Presidency of Madras, thereby estranging the people there also.

The annexation of various States on one pretext or the other created a sense of insecurity in the minds of the rulers of other states. Inwardly, they harboured hostile feelings towards the British Government and if they remained loyal during the rising of 1857 it was due to a still greater fear of the revolutionaries whose success would have surely endangered their position. These annexations were especially unpopular with the thousands of native state servants who became unemployed as a result thereof. The British Government also straight-away dismissed all the native regiments of

the annexed states. Even those whose services were retained after the annexation were not happy as they could not aspire to rise to such high posts under the British control as they could under the native rulers. The people in general also felt aggrieved by the change. A native ruler with all his shortcomings was still preferred over the British rule which was foreign to them. We, therefore, come across several instances of risings against the British authority in the state of Oudh. Even Lord Canning admitted that there was a national resistance in Oudh where the common people had joined hands with Talukdars and Jagirdars.

Indians were equally suspicious of social and religious reforms introduced by the British. Lord William Bentinck had prohibited Sati and Infanticide. He had declared that any body who violated these prohibitions or was guilty of incitement would be dealt with very severely. Many great reformers had also preached against these cruel customs. Even Akbar had tried to stop these practices. However, no Indian ruler had so far dared to make these penal offences. The intentions of the British behind this reform were good. They sincerely wanted to remove these curses from the Hindu society. Unfortunately, the orthodox classes resented these reforms since they considered them as attempts to interfere with their religion and when the widows were permitted to re-marry there was a general feeling of resentment among the people. It was widely believed that by these steps the British Government were trying to convert them to Christianity. The activities of the British missionaries, who had been preaching in India for the last over two centuries, served to confirm these fears. They had established many schools and colleges and had tried to familiarise the people with the Western civilization. Several missionaries had been the pioneers of the Western education in India. Unfortunately, in their zeal to spread Christianity among the natives they began to attack the Indian religions directly from the beginning of the nineteenth century. This made them very unpopular. Lord Minto tried to curb their activities but did not succeed in his efforts as these missionaries were patronised by the Home Government and also found favour with many top ranking British officers in India. Lately, the Government had passed a law according to which an Indian convert to Christianity forfeited his claim over the property of his ancestors. The sepoys were convinced that the Government reserved high positions

in the army for those Indians who joined Christianity. At this critical time when the Indians had already been greatly perturbed by the zeal of the missionaries, the greased cartridges containing the fat of hog and cow were introduced. The sepoys thought that the British Government intended to degrade them in the eyes of their countrymen and then attract them to the fold of Christianity.

Lord Dalhousie introduced railways in the country. This brought about a revolution in the communication system and greatly improved the contacts between the people in different parts of the country. However, no separate compartments were reserved for the people belonging to the high castes who hated to be touched by those belonging to the lower classes. In the newly-opened hospitals and schools also no such segregational arrangements existed. Majority of the people also did not appreciate the development of the telegraphic system. The orthodox classes resented these changes and felt that the British Government were bent upon the spoliation of their religion. All the new changes were so greatly misunderstood by the people that instead of winning their applause for the Government they turned them against it.

The Indians of that period were generally superstitious. It was widely believed that the British rule would come to an end in 1857 i.e., one hundred years after the Battle of Plassey. At this time, when the atmosphere all over the country was so hostile to the British, the latter showed an utter lack of realism. Primarily it was due to the fact that they had never tried to feel the pulse of Indian people. At least at this time they should have tried to win back the confidence of the people by assuring them that they had no intention to interfere in their religion or to deny them their due rights. Instead they adopted a very harsh policy thereby giving an impetus to the feelings of resentment.

The earliest event reported is that a Lashkari employed at Dum Dum requested a Brahmin sepoy to let him have a little water from his jar. The Brahmin flatly refused this request of the untouchable. The Lashkari retorted that he was already a degraded man as he had used the greased cartridge that contained the fat of the cow. The Brahmin sepoy was stunned and on his return to the barracks he immediately informed his colleagues of the incident. The news spread quickly inflaming the sentiments all round. The sepoys acquainted General Hearsey, their Commanding Officer, of

their apprehensions. He advised them to be calm and suggested to the Government that the cartridges should be greased by the sepoy themselves. It was a sane suggestion. Unfortunately, the Adjutant General did not appreciate it and turned it down on the plea that it would increase the duties of the sepoy and would not be in the interest of the Government. However, he desired the sepoy to be informed that the cartridges contained only mutton fat and wax. General Hearsey called the soldiers in a meeting and explained to them that the Government had no mind to convert them into Christians. But it did not serve any purpose. The greased cartridges remained.

The unrest among the sepoy of various cantonments became more and more pronounced. Major Orscur Cavenagh, on his return from Agra, had given a very discouraging report about the dubious loyalty of the sepoy there. He also informed the Government of the whispers he had overheard among the Indian sepoy planning to massacre their officers when the latter were asleep. There had also been a rising of the nineteenth Indian regiment but the Government did not realise the gravity of the situation and after disbanding this regiment thought that the whole thing had been suppressed. However, the disbanding of the regiment, instead of discouraging others, gave them impetus as the sepoy of the disbanded regiment were considered as martyrs in the cause of independence and religion.

On the 29th March, Mangal Pandey, an Indian sepoy, shot down his British officer, Lt. Baugh. The whole of his regiment witnessed the event but no body intervened. General Hearsey, reached the spot and arrested Mangal Pandey. The sepoy was shot after a court martial. The whole of the regiment mutinied and was consequently disbanded on the 4th of May. The Government still did not realise the grim nature of this unrest. The native regiment at Meerut rose in open revolt against the British authority. It was widely believed among the sepoy at Meerut that the flour used for their meals contained ground bones. They refused to use the cartridges. Eighty-five of them were arrested and dealt with very severely in the presence of their colleagues. The sepoy mutinied and after murdering several of their officers and other Europeans, moved to the city of Delhi. A spirit of mutiny prevailed among the native regiments posted in Northern India from Calcutta to Meerut.

There was no strong British army all along this route to check the hurricane. Although there was a respectable division of the British at Meerut, it did not take any strong action against the rebels who were allowed to leave for Delhi with their weapons. The rebels appeared before the Red Fort and requested Bahadur Shah, the Mughal Emperor, to become their leader. Although he was estranged with the British Government, he did not feel strong enough to join the rebels. He hesitated in the beginning and even tried to dissuade the sepoys from their proposed action but when the latter murdered Captain Douglas and several other Europeans at Delhi and appeared in the Diwan-e-Aam in large numbers the Mughal Emperor had no alternative but to join them.

The rising at Meerut and the joining of the Mughal Emperor in the struggle gave encouragement to the sepoys all over the country to rise in revolt against the British authority. Native regiments at Ferozpur, Muzaffarnagar, Aligarh, Naushehra, Etawa, Roorkee, Etah, Bareilly, Mathura, Lucknow and Shahjahanpur rose in the month of May, while those at Moradabad, Badaon, Banaras, Kanpur, Allahabad, Faizabad, and Fatehpur arose in the first week of June. They were joined by such people as had any personal grudge against the British Government. Several important nobles and chiefs also joined the sepoys to avenge the wrong done to them. The main centres of resistance were Delhi, Patna, Lucknow, Kanpur, Agra and Jhansi. Delhi was the rallying point of the sepoys. All over the northern India the Mughal Emperor was declared as the sovereign of the country. Bahadur Shah himself sent letters to the rulers of all the important states of India asking them to join the movement and to help him turn out the foreigners. But many of them did not consider the cause of the Mughal Emperor to be very strong. They thought that he was no match to the British. The rebels did not receive help from many important native chiefs who, instead, joined the British Government in the suppression of this rising. Most unfortunately for the rebels, the Punjab under Sir John Lawrence remained loyal to the British and the revolutionaries were without any capable leaders.

Lord Canning made intensive efforts to suppress the rising as quickly as possible. He requisitioned forces from Ceylon and also succeeded in diverting to Calcutta a force under Lord Elgin which was going to China. Thus he made complete arrangements to curb the

rising. Fortunately for the British, the native forces of the Western and Southern Commands remained loyal. Still it was difficult for them to overcome the rising within a short time. The British had no European regiments at Banaras, Allahabad and Kanpur. They had a regiment each at Dinapur, Lucknow and Agra but these were quite insufficient to overcome the formidable number of sepoys all over northern India who had also been joined by the civil population. Lord Canning was also apprehensive of the Nawab of Oudh who was present at Calcutta with a large number of his retainers. The latter, however, remained faithful to the British Government. The situation remained threatening for several months but gradually the rising was overcome. General Anson advanced from Anbala to recapture the city of Delhi. The army at Meerut was also sent instructions to move towards Delhi. Anson died at this critical juncture and the army was then led by Sir Henry Barnard. It advanced towards Delhi and was joined by the army of Meerut at Alipur on the 6th of June 1857. It was a pity that although the sepoys in Delhi held a formidable position they made no move either to obstruct the British army from Meerut or to make suitable arrangements for the defence of Delhi against the forces advancing from Punjab. But for some isolated attempts no serious or concerted effort was made by the Delhi army to meet the challenge. A battle was fought at Hindon wherein the rebels were defeated and forced to fall back on Delhi. They were again defeated at the Battle of Badli-Ki-Sarai and Sir Henry Barnard took possession of the Ridge from where he could move towards Delhi with an advantage.

The occupation of the Ridge by the British made the Mughal Emperor think seriously of the rapidly deteriorating situation, especially when the law and order in Delhi had also got out of hand. Bakht Khan, sometime a subedar under the British Government and now a partisan of the rebels, was appointed as the Commander-in-Chief of the forces and the administrator of the city. He improved the morale of the army and re-established law and order in the city. He even tried to re-occupy the Ridge but failed. Nicholson, who had, in the meanwhile, taken over the command of the British forces, began advancing towards the walls of the city. He defeated every move of the rebels to check him. The final assault on Delhi was delivered from three points, i.e., Kashmeri Gate, Mori Gate

and Kabuli Gate, on the 20th September 1857. Nicholson broke the resistance of the rebels and took over the city. Bahadur Shah escaped to Humayun Tomb but was arrested. Princes Mirza Mughal, Abu Bakr and Khair Sultan were also arrested and shot dead without any trial. Their heads were later presented to the aged Bahadur Shah in a tray. With the fall of Delhi and the arrest of the Mughal Emperor, the rebels lost their rallying point, their flag and their spirit.

We now turn to Kanpur which was another important centre of the sepoys. Nann Sahib was the leader of the rebels here. Unfortunately he was not a good soldier and therefore could not win any decisive battle against the British. However, he maintained his control over Kanpur for some time. He was finally defeated by General Campbell in 1859. He escaped to Nepal and nothing more was heard about him.

Lucknow was another important centre of the struggle. The British faced the most determined resistance here. Razrat Begam and Maulvi Ahmed Ullah led the sepoys and the common people here. The sepoys fought very tenaciously. Even Lord Canning admitted that the sepoys fought for every inch of land and could claim honour and appreciation for their heroic deeds in the struggle in and around this city. The sepoys, however, could not hold out for long against the organised forces of General Campbell and finally withdrew from the city after about two years.

Jhansi was another centre of the rebels. They were led by the Rani Laxmi Bai of Jhansi. She not only organised the sepoys but also established a benevolent rule in her state. She was, however, defeated by Sir Hugh Rose who re-established British rule in this area. Tantia Toppe, who had joined hands with the Rani, escaped from the battle-field with the remnant of his forces and continued fighting stray battles. He later on adopted guerilla warfare tactics but was finally exterminated in 1859.

At Dinapur Kanwar Singh of Jagdishpur was the leader of the rebels. General Campbell finally broke down the resistance of the rebels after several engagements and re-established law and order in the city. There were several other centres of rising but the British authority could not be thrown over and as soon as a strong British army appeared, the sepoys gave way without any serious fighting.

The rising failed due to several reasons. It was not properly planned. Majority of the rebels were not aware of the object for which they had taken up arms. It was more a grouse of the various discontented and dissatisfied elements against the British than a real planned rising of a nation against its oppressive master. The people on the whole were dissatisfied with the British Government for its various oppressive measures and unpopular reforms. They, however, also could not appreciate the idea of a mass rising of the nation against its rulers. They had not yet been educated or awakened sufficiently to understand the importance of Independence.

This rising, however, cleared the political horizon and made both the rulers and the ruled feel the necessity of reaching a better mutual understanding. The British became more considerate after the Mutiny. The Indians also realised the futility of an armed revolt against a master who was superior both in arms and administration. The rising, moreover, paved the way for the Indians to make a concerted effort for their freedom. This also brought together men of various provinces who began to think in terms of a common nationality. These ties were further strengthened by education and other reforms and by the close of the 19th century, persons from various provinces began to meet together to chalk out a common programme for an organised struggle to regain their independence.

The Indian sepoys would have given a better account of themselves if there had been a unity of command and a co-ordinated effort to drive out the foreigners. This would perhaps have avoided the massacre of the innocent Europeans which is a blot on the name of the Indian sepoys and others involved in these inhuman atrocities. Unfortunately, the European writers too have given an exaggerated account of things in their writings. Undoubtedly, the role of the Indians involved in these atrocities was lamentable and cannot be justified on any grounds. On the other hand, it is equally sad that these very European writers completely ignore the atrocities committed by the relieving British armies at various centres of uprising. The British forces were definitely more disciplined—a qualification which gave them victory over the Indian sepoys—and could be easily dissuaded from a course which brought an equally bad name to them for their excesses. Russel condemned the inhuman tortures inflicted by the British and wrote, "All these kinds of vindictive, unchristian, Indian torture, such as sewing Mohamedans in pig-skins, smearing

them with pork-fat before execution, and burning their bodies and forcing Hindus to defile themselves, are disgraceful". It is a pity that both the Indians and the Europeans lost their sense of balance during that period and none had realistic view of things. The atrocities and counter-atrocities estranged the rulers and the ruled. But for the Queen's declaration of 1858 it would have taken the British Government in India several decades to re-establish its authority and create an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

The rule of British East India Company came to an end. The British Crown took over the administration of the British Indian Empire. The Queen withdrew all such measures as could antagonise the Indians again. By her declaration of 1858, she established in India a Government which met majority of the reasonable demands of the Indians. The Government was no more to interfere with their religion. They were to be given a role in the services according to merit. The native rulers were informed that the British Government had no desire to extend its boundaries at their cost. The Governor General was hence-forth to be known as a Viceroy. The Board of Control was abolished. A Secretary of State for India was appointed in England to look after the Indian administration and to keep both the Queen and the British Parliament informed of the day to day developments in India. Lord Canning was named as the first Viceroy of India.

BRITISH VICEROYS IN INDIA (1857—1916)

EARL OF CANNING (1857—1862)

Governor General (1856-1857)

Viceroy (1857—1862)

LORD Canning was born on the 14th of December, 1812 at Brompton, London. He was the third son of George Canning and was educated at Eton and Christ Church. He became a Member of Parliament in 1836. He became Under Secretary, Foreign Affairs in 1841 and Post Master General in the Aberdeen Ministry in 1852. He assumed office as the Governor General of India on the 29th of February, 1856.

Lord Canning was a man of peace. He came to India determined to devote himself to the work relating to administration and other peaceful ventures like the extension of the roads, railways and telegraph lines, initiated by his predecessor. However, he was not oblivious of other possibilities. In his farewell speech he remarked, "I wish for a peaceful term of office. But I cannot forget that in the sky of India, serene as it is, a small cloud may arise no larger than a man's hand, but which, growing larger and larger, may at last threaten to burst and over-whelm us with ruin." (Makers of British India).

As apprehended by Lord Canning in his farewell speech, he, could not follow his policy of peace in spite of all his efforts. He had to wage a war against Persia over the question of Herat. But the biggest set-back to his policy was given by the rising of 1857 when the whole of northern India rose in revolt against the British authority. The lead was given by the dissatisfied sepoys of the Bengal regiment. They had several grievances and their accumulated hatred was triggered off by the introduction of greased cartridges which they had to bite before using them. They rose at Meerut, Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow, Jhansi and several other military stations all over northern India. They were joined by several dissatisfied chiefs who had been alienated by the Doctrine of Lapse of Lord Dalhousie. The whole of Oudh was up in arms. Nana Saheb, the adopted son of Peshwa Baji Rao II, led the rebels at Kanpur. The Mughal Emperor became the rallying point at Delhi. Kanwar Singh of Jagdispur led

the dissatisfied masses in Bihar. The Rani of Jhansi became the leader of the dissatisfied people in Central India.

Unfortunately, the efforts of the rebels were not properly co-ordinated. They were also without good generals and leaders. Lord Canning diverted to India the British army under Elgin which was on its way to China. He also requisitioned the forces posted in Burma and Ceylon. Experienced commanders like Havelock, Outram, Nicholson, Wilson and Colin Campbell fought valiantly and restored order in the disturbed areas after defeating the rebels. Adams has complimented the efforts of the British, particularly the Governor General, in these words: "That a fatal catastrophe was avoided, must be attributed, in the first place, to the high courage and fortitude of the English race, as exemplified at almost every station where they were tested; and, in the second, to the firmness, calmness, patience, and resolution of the Governor General who met with unfailing steadfastness the agonies and terrible anxieties of a crisis such as no one of his predecessors had ever been called upon to encounter." The services of Lord Canning were duly appreciated by the Home Government. After the Crown took over the administration of India under the Government of India Act of 1858, Lord Canning was appointed as the first Viceroy of the British Empire in India.

The Home Government had long since felt the inconvenience of having a dual control over India by the Board of Control appointed by them and the Directors appointed by the Company. They also thought it unsafe to leave the control of such an extensive Empire to a trading company. The rising of 1857, which had been suppressed with the help of the Home Government, gave the latter a plausible excuse to deprive the British East India Company of its Indian possessions. By the act of 1858, therefore, the Indian possessions of the British East India Company were taken over by the Crown. The Board of Control was abolished. The directors of the Company were permitted to deal only with the matters relating to trade. A Secretary of State for India, who was to be a member of the British Cabinet and answerable to the British Parliament, was given the control of the Indian affairs. He was to be assisted by an Under Secretary and a Council of fifteen members, seven of whom were to be elected by the Directors of the Company and the other eight to be nominated by the Crown. These eight members generally used to be chosen from among the British officers who had returned from India after a long association with its affairs and could guide the

Secretary by their personal knowledge of the country and its administration. The Secretary of State for India enjoyed overriding powers over the decisions of his council. He was the appointing authority for the members of the Viceroy's Executive Council and also of the Governors of Bombay and Madras. After the establishment of a telegraphic link between England and India, the Secretary of State began to interfere in the Indian affairs a little too much and various Governors General who had to get prior approval of the Home Government on all important and significant issues, felt quite annoyed about it.

The rising of 1857 stunned the whole of the British nation. It was in no way less significant than the American War of Independence except that it was not actually a freedom struggle and in the end failed to achieve its object. However, the British Government realised the futility of a policy of repression. To control India effectively it was essential to follow a policy of appeasement to win over the masses by a liberal policy of non-interference in their religion, customs and usages and to give them opportunities in the administration of their country. The native army had proved unreliable. Therefore, to maintain control over India, a strong British army was posted at strategic stations to guard the arsenals and important forts. All the forces of the East India Company were absorbed in the service of the Crown. The Civil Servants also became the employees of the Crown.

The British Government took particular care not to offend the Indians any more by provocative announcements. In the Queen's proclamation of 1858 which was read by Lord Canning at Allahabad and by the Governors of the provinces in their capitals it was declared that the British Government sincerely desired the restoration of peace in India and to forget completely the bitter memories of 1857. Many concessions were announced, which, although vague, still proved very handy to the Indian National Congress to press its demand for equality in services and a fair representation in the Legislative Councils. The declaration ensured a general pardon and goodwill to Indians, except those who had been directly responsible for the murder of British citizens. It was also declared that no distinction of caste or creed would be made while making appointments to services. However, for the persons who had afforded shelter to the murderers of the British or who played a direct or indirect role in the rising, the proclamation said, "To those who

have willingly given an asylum to murderers, knowing them to be such, their lives alone cannot be guaranteed ; but in apportioning the penalty due to such persons, full consideration will be given to any circumstances under which they have been induced to throw off their allegiance ; and large indulgence will be shown to those crimes may appear to have originated in too credulous acceptance of the reports circulated by designing men."

The declaration promised a good rule to the people under which they could expect justice, freedom of worship and a fair chance of rising to the responsible position in the Government. The declaration also assured the people of India that due consideration would be given to their "ancient rights, usages and customs" in every new legislation. Many nobles and landlords, who had directly or indirectly participated in the revolt against the British and had been hiding, for fear of their vengeance surrendered themselves as soon as they knew about this declaration, and claimed the restoration of their lands and property. No person, according to the proclamation, was to be debarred from holding a high post for which he was qualified by his education, ability and integrity. Unfortunately, these assurances were not kept by the British Viceroys in the 19th Century and Shri G.K. Gokhale, a great national leader, plainly said at the 5th session of the Indian National Congress that "The terms of the enactment of 1833 and the proclamation of 1858 are so explicit that those who now try to withhold the privileges then assured to us must be prepared to face the painful dilemma of hypocrisy or treachery, must be prepared to admit that England was insincere when she made those promises or that she is prepared to break faith with us now."

The rulers of the different native states were assured that henceforth the British Government would give due consideration to their dignity, rights and privileges, that no further attempt would be made to annex their States to the British Empire and that the rulers who did not have a natural heir, would be allowed to adopt one. The native rulers were further assured that "all treaties and engagements made with them, or under the authority of the Honourable East India Company, are by us accepted, and will be scrupulously maintained, and we look for the like observance on their part. We desire no extension of our present territorial possessions. We shall respect the rights, dignity and honour of native princes as our own." 160 Sanads giving right of adoptions to the Indian rulers were given by Lord Canning and another seventeen by Lord Lansdowne.

Lord Canning was also prompt to appreciate the services of the native rulers who had stood by the British and helped them to tide over the crisis. These chiefs and nobles were not only honoured with high titles but several new territories were also added to their states. They were also upgraded in their ranks. The Maharaja of Patiala, the Rann of Knpurthula, the Nizam of Hyderabad, the Ruler of Karauli, the Rann of Udaipur and the Begum of Bhopal received several honours and titles for their meritorious services during the struggle.

The rising of 1857 impressed upon the British the necessity of reorganising the whole of the administrative machinery. The Government had been taken by surprise by this catastrophe. They had never realised that they had become so unpopular. Their social and administrative reforms had earned them much hatred. Therefore, they now planned to manage affairs in such a way that they could know the reaction of the Indians to their reforms. They wanted to relate their legislative measures to the popular Indian opinion so that nothing could be contrary to the people's usages and customs. Even Sir Bartle Frere, a member of the Governor General's Council, once remarked, "It was dangerous to legislate for millions of people with few means of knowing except by a rebellion whether the laws suited them or not."

By the Charter Act of 1833 a new member had been added to the Governor General's Council exclusively for looking after the legislative work and the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras were deprived of their legislative powers. This system did not work well. The Presidencies did not favour some of the measures promulgated by the Centre as they were not in accordance with the local conditions. It was felt that some body must represent the point of view of the Presidencies at the Central Council, if the latter was to legislate for them. The Charter Act of 1853 removed this handicap and six members were added to the Governor General's Council. Two of them represented the Supreme Court while the other four were the representatives of the provincial Governments of Bombay, Madras, Bengal and N.W.P. In spite of this the situation did not improve, as these representatives were only officials of their respective Governments and were not much conversant with the views of the people for whom they made laws. The Act of 1861 removed both these handicaps. By this Act the Council of the Viceroy was

remodelled. The representation of the Supreme Court and of the four Presidencies was done away with. The legislative work was decentralized and the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay and Madras were given the powers to appoint their own legislative councils, consisting of four to eight members, not less than half of whom were non-officials. The Viceroy's Council was expanded. He was authorised to appoint six to twelve additional members, not less than half of whom were to be non-officials. The Maharaja of Patiala, Raja Dinkar Rao and Raja Deo Narain Singh of Banaras were the first Indians to join the Viceroy's Council. The Viceroy in Council was authorised to establish legislative councils for North Western Province and the Punjab. Although the Governments of Bengal, Bombay and Madras were given the right to legislate for their respective Presidencies, in reality they had been shorn of the powers and privileges they had enjoyed before 1833 because the Legislative Councils of these Presidencies had to obtain the prior approval of the Central authority before introducing any legislative measures for their respective areas. The councillors at the Centre as also in the provinces were to hold office for two years.

Although this act increased the number of the non-official members both in the Central and the provincial councils, yet, to safeguard the British interests it deprived the Councils of their powers. No bill could be introduced either in the Central or in the provincial councils without the assent of the Governor General. The non-official members were generally chosen from the ruling chiefs or aristocratic families and could not afford to displease the Viceroy. Their presence in the councils was merely figurative and had no particular effect on the legislative measures. Several important subjects like foreign affairs, defence and religion were treated as reserved subjects and were not within the purview of these councillors. Dr. H. L. Singh has correctly evaluated the Act, "Thus (The act of) 1861 was in a measure, the extension, abridgement and modification of the existing arrangement. The provision relating to the establishment of local councils and the appointment of non-official members marked an improvement on the previous system, while the restrictions on their functions deprived them of some of the most essential attributes of a legislature and in this respect the act was a retrograde step." The over-cautious attitude of the Government did not allow these councils to play a useful role. Principal S. R. Sharma wrote "The act of 1861 deconcentra-

ted the legislative functions in India without in any way going back to the chaos of the pre-1833 days." According to Principal G. N. Singh, the Act of 1861 was an important constitutional measure as it associated the Indians with their legislative work and also decentralised the legislative functions, ultimately leading to the grant of complete internal provincial autonomy in 1937. This Act, however, was in accordance with the wishes of Sir Charles Wood who wanted the native chiefs and aristocracy to be associated with the legislative work in India.

It was also declared in the Queen's proclamation that "it is our further will that, so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed, be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge". Till then the East India Company had discouraged the appointment of Indians to the Indian Civil Service. The training in England and other restrictions also stood in the way and no Indian could get appointed to the Indian Civil Service. It was considered that the Indians could compete with the British in the examination but they did not possess enough moral courage to take important decisions. It was feared that if they were successful in the competition and were subsequently appointed to high posts, many British officers in India might have to serve under them, which would be an intolerable situation. Again, the persons coming through the open competition would be belonging to different social strata and not necessarily to the aristocratic families. It was, therefore, thought necessary to discourage the Indians from competing in the examination. This was against the recommendation of the Services Commission, appointed in India for holding simultaneous examinations in England and India for recruitment to the Civil Services. It was, however, decided that besides holding a competition in England some appointments may be made from among the members of the uncovenanted Civil Service to the covenanted Civil Service. The Governor General-in-Council could appoint any one to these posts provided that a person so appointed must have been a resident of India for the last seven years and conversant with the language of the district where he was posted. Thus, although by the Indian Civil Service Act of 1861 the Indians were made eligible for the Senior Civil Services, they were deprived of the privilege by having to go to England for taking the examina-

tion. The Indians also could not be appointed to the posts of collectors, magistrates, judges and Commissioners.

Lord Macaulay had drawn up the Penal Code in 1837. It was revised and adopted under Lord Canning. By this revision the Criminal Code was simplified according to which the justices of peace could punish even the members of the ruling families.

In the suppression of the rising of 1857 the British Government in India had had to incur a heavy expenditure. It had borrowed the British forces from the Home Government to meet the situation and had been obliged to pay for them. Also the Government had to spend a huge amount on the restoration of law and order. On the other hand, revenues could not be realised from provinces and the financial situation further deteriorated. During the last four years there had been a deficit of thirty-six million sterling. In 1861, the Government had to levy several taxes to meet the expenditure. Income-tax was introduced. A tax on the trades and professions and also on commodities like tobacco was imposed. A ten per cent export duty on saltpetre was levied. There was no opposition to these taxes from any quarter except the Government of Madras. Sir Charles Trevelyan, the Governor of the province, opposed these taxes on the plea that the Government was giving nothing to the people in exchange thereof. This opposition cost Sir Trevelyan his post but it made the Finance Member, Mr. James Wilson, revise his budget. Except the imposition of an income-tax for five years, all other taxes were kept pending for further consideration and were not imposed immediately.

The North Western region of India witnessed a big famine in 1860 due to the shortage of rainfall. About half a million people lost their lives. The Government adopted all possible relief measures and also remitted land revenue.

Lord Canning also paid attention to the extension of various reforms introduced by his predecessors. In 1862 railway line from Calcutta to Allahabad was completed. The development of roads and other works of public utility were also attended to. Lord Canning encouraged the plantation of tea in Kumaon, Kangra and Darjeeling and the plantation of Coffee in Mysore, Coorg and Wainad. The lawlessness due to the turmoil of 1857 was on its decline and the people were gradually settling down to peaceful occupations. Lord Canning gave limited powers of civil jurisdiction

to landlords in Bengal in order to ensure lasting peace. He also interested himself in the reform of jails. In order to bring down the expenses on the maintenance of prisoners, he provided them with work, the income of which was adjusted towards their expenditure. In accordance with the spirit of Sir Charles Wood's despatch of 1854, Lord Canning interested himself in the education of the Indians and opened universities in the Presidencies of Bengal, Bombay and Madras. He also started a medical college at Lahore.

Lord Canning next turned his attention towards the revenue problem of Bengal. The Permanent Settlement of Lord Cornwallis had been a one-sided settlement. It gave a privileged position to the zamindars and left the cultivators or peasants at their mercy. In 1859 Lord Canning introduced a Bill to redress their grievances. It was passed and became known as the Bengal Rent Act, 1859. By this Act the ryots, who had been tilling a particular piece of land for a continuous period of 20 years, were given some rights on that land. The zamindars could not increase the rent of that land without any valid reason, accepted by a court of law. This Act also gave to all such tenants or ryots as were in possession of a land for the last ten years, the occupancy rights on that land. They could not be evicted. Fair rents and fixity of tenure were the two important clauses of this Act.

Lord Canning also intervened in the quarrel between the indigo planters and their cultivators. These planters used to give a loan and a piece of land for cultivation to their ryots after obtaining an undertaking from them that they would only plant indigo on that land. The crop did not yield much profit to the cultivators but it helped the planters to carry on a prosperous trade in that commodity. The condition of the cultivators was miserable but they were helpless as they had no other source from where they could take a loan for the next crop. The planters were protected by law according to which a cultivator could be imprisoned for six months if he did not fulfil his undertaking with the planter after the acceptance of the loan. The price of the indigo could be increased but the planters, when giving the new loan, could equally increase the interest on the loan or the rent of the land. Lord Canning came to the conclusion that the indigo planters were unduly harsh towards the cultivators. He advised them not to exploit the poor people. He admitted that instead of giving protection to the planters, the Government should

have taken up the cause of the cultivators. The planters did not listen to him and in the long run their policy of exploitation forced many cultivators to migrate to other lands, thus forcing many planters to close down their business.

The only notable event during the viceroyalty of Lord Canning was the hostility shown by the Raja of Sikkim. Dr. Campbell attacked the State but failed to achieve any success. Colonel Gawler was next despatched with an army. He defeated the state forces and forced the ruler to submit.

The reorganisation of the army had been necessitated by the rebellion of the majority of the Bengal regiments in 1857 and their subsequent disbanding. The British Government could no longer repose its confidence in a native army. Even the assurance given in the Queen's proclamation of 1858 that no discrimination would be made in the services, was not followed. Before the rising of 1857, the percentage of British soldiers in the Indian army was only 14. Although the Indians did not get commissions in the army, yet they held many key and strategic positions. They were recruited as gunners and were in service at different arsenals. The situation, however, changed after 1857. They were no more to be enlisted as gunners and they were also not to be given superior arms. They could not be posted at an arsenal. Many of the native regiments were disbanded and a strict watch was kept over the rest. The British element in the army was increased proportionately. When Lord Canning left India there were eighty thousand European soldiers as against one lakh forty thousand Indian sepoys. In the south there was to be a ratio of 3 : 1 between the Indians and the European soldiers, but on the whole there was to be a ratio of 2 : 1 between the native and the British soldiers. With the transfer of the Government from the Company to the Crown the question of the transfer of European soldiers of the East India Company to the service of the Crown came up. Unfortunately, the Government did not show any consideration towards these soldiers who had borne the brunt of the fighting in 1857. Not to speak of showing any regard for their past services by giving some remuneration or reward to every soldier the Home Government straightaway ordered their transfer to the service of the Crown. The European soldiers protested against this and demanded suitable compensation from the Company for their services. The Home Government did not agree

to this proposal and Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, declared in the Parliament that all such soldiers as would not accept this transfer would be discharged from the service with a free passage to England. The declaration led to a great resentment and eight thousand British soldiers applied for their discharge. This incident is known as the "White Mutiny". It was not a sane step as the Government had to spend a lot on the recruitment of new British soldiers who were also not very well-acquainted with the conditions prevailing in India.

The structure of the native army was also reorganised. The old system of creating regiments on the basis of caste and creed was discarded. Under the new system, every regiment consisted of soldiers of divergent creeds and provinces which made it virtually impossible for them to join together in a conspiracy against the British. The Sikhs, the Gurkhas and the Pathans who had exhibited loyalty during 1857, were encouraged to join the native army. The native artillery was disbanded and the native soldiers were provided with inferior arms so that they could not become a danger to the Government. After the Crown took over the Indian Government there was no necessity of having an Indian naval force which was disbanded without any proper reward for the services of the persons manning this force although they had helped the British Government and the British East India Company to win several battles in India during the past five decades. Men in high ranks were pensioned off while the ordinary sea-men were discharged without any compensation.

Lord Canning had not been keeping a good health for the last several months of his Viceroyalty. He was, therefore, allowed to leave for England in March, 1862 after handing over his charge to Earl of Elgin. He died in England a few months later i.e. on the 17th June, 1862.

Although not as great as his predecessor, Lord Dalhousie, Lord Canning was a man of resolution, justice and patience. Trotter has thus described him, "after all deductions, his name will stand fair in English memories as that of a fearless, true-hearted Englishman, who encountered, on the whole with credit, the two-fold misfortune of a great sepoy revolt and a predecessor unmatched in Indian history." Lord Curzon described him as "calm amid the tumult, silent in the

face of obloquy, resolute upon the great and crowning lesson of mercy."

EARL OF ELGIN (1862-1863)

Lord Elgin, who succeeded Lord Canning as the British Viceroy in India, was born in London on the 24th of July, 1811. He was educated at Eton and Christ Church. His father, Lt. Gen. Thomas, was a well-known general and a diplomat. This helped him to choose his career easily. He entered Parliament in 1841 as a member from Southampton and became the Governor of Jamaica in 1842. He held this post for four years. His next assignment was the governorship of Canada from 1846 to 1854. In 1857 he was sent as British envoy to China to claim compensation from that Government for its excesses towards the British. As a result of his efforts the Chinese Emperor was forced to sue for peace and agreed to keep a British envoy at his court.

Lord Elgin had gained enough experience in the fields of administration and diplomacy when he took over his assignment as Viceroy of India in March, 1862. He had seen active service abroad for two decades and now wanted to rest. He was, therefore, not very keen to take up the new job. He also apprehended adverse effects of the Indian climate on his health and prophetically remarked in one of his farewell addresses, "The vast amount of labour devolving upon the Governor General of India, the insalubrity of the climate, and the advance of years, all tend to render the prospect of our meeting again remote and uncertain."

However, on his arrival in India he did not see any exciting or eventful career. The main task confronting him was the settlement of the country. He frankly admitted this in one of his remarks "I succeed to a great man (Lord Dalhousie) and a great war (rising of 1857), with a humble task to be humbly discharged".

As stated above, Lord Elgin was not very enthusiastic to break new grounds either in the foreign policy or in the home affairs. He wanted to restore order and to strengthen the frontier defences. However, even in this task he could play only a limited and restricted role because he could not take any independent decision. He had to obtain orders from the Secretary of State on all cases. This galling tutelage was resented by the Governor General, although he never gave vent to his feelings in any of his despatches to the Home Government. But this becomes clear from his private conversations and

correspondence. Once he said to one of his colleagues that "The first virtue which you and I have to practise here at present is self-denial. We must walk for a time at least in paths traced out for us by others".

During his short tenure he sincerely believed in the famous saying of Walpole, "Let the sleeping dogs lie". He refused to impose any new taxes which might evoke opposition of the people. He avoided continuing an old tax which might prove a burden to the people and make him unpopular. Some changes were brought about in the executive councils of the Viceroy and the Presidencies. Mr. Laing, a great economist, resigned due to his illness and was succeeded by Sir Charles Trevelyan, formerly the Governor of Madras. Mr. Ritchie, the law member, died. Sir Bartle Frere became the Governor of Bombay and Mr. Cecil Beadon was appointed as the Governor of Bengal. Lord Elgin tried to rule in accordance with the declaration of the Queen, *i.e.* the least interference in the usages and customs of the people in India and justice to all without any distinction of high or low. He realised that the country had not as yet recovered fully from the ravages of 1857. Therefore, he personally looked into the administration of various provinces. He planned to tour the whole country extensively to acquaint himself with the actual state of affairs. First of all he undertook a tour of northern India. He held a Durbar at Banaras and advised the people to invest more money in the projects for the construction and the development of the railways. At Kanpur he paid a tribute to the British soldiers who had laid down their lives during the rising of 1857. At Agra he enjoined upon the people to make a contribution every year towards the construction of the roads and the building of the schools. At Ambala he asked the people to help the Government in the progress of the country. Then he went to Simla from where he moved into the Kangra hills. He had a heart attack during the journey and was removed immediately to Dharamsala where he died on the 20th November, 1863.

The Viceroyalty of Lord Elgin was not utterly devoid of any incident. There was a minor revolt on the frontier which was inspired by a religious sect of the Muslims, known as 'Wahabis'. These people had their strong-hold at Malka and their co-religionists had their centres all over northern India from Peshawar to Calcutta. These people had created a lot of trouble under their religious leader,

Syed Ahmed Shah, during the period of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. They were, however, suppressed with an iron hand and remained quiet during the next three decades. Taking advantage of the change of Government in the Punjab and the rising of 1857, they again led several plundering raids into the British territories. They launched a holy war against the British Government and were joined by several frontier tribes of the Pathans and the Afghans. Sir Neville Chamberlain was despatched with an army to put down their rising. They were vanquished and their strong-hold was destroyed.

The foreign policy of Lord Elgin was uneventful. Dost Mohammed, the ruler of Afghanistan, was busy in an aggressive struggle in Herat. He had remained neutral during the rising of 1857. Rather, he had obliged the British Government by ignoring the various requests made to him by the Indian revolutionaries. Lord Elgin, therefore, refused to interfere on behalf of the State of Herat and only made a mild protest to the Afghan ruler against his policy. Later on, when the Afghan ruler turned a deaf ear to these protests he withdrew his envoy from Afghanistan. Nothing beyond this was done, as Lord Elgin was fully aware of the complications arising out of a policy of active participation in the Middle-East affairs. He refused to be a party to this quarrel between the Afghans and the Persians. He was equally pacific when in June 1863, Dost Mohammed died and a war of succession followed among his sons. Sher Ali was the first to succeed. Lord Elgin sent an envoy to his court with a friendly letter. However, soon thereafter Sher Ali lost his throne in the war of succession.

Viscount Mersey has described him as a practical, resolute man with a strong sense of duty and a forceful character. Lord Elgin, in fact, got no time in India to prove his mettle and the little work that he took in hand was so insignificant as compared to the achievements of his predecessors or successors that some of the writers have not bothered to write much beyond a sentence for him; that, he came to India simply to meet his death as prophesized by him in one of his farewell speeches.

LORD LAWRENCE (1864—1869)

Lord Lawrence succeeded Lord Elgin in 1864 as the Viceroy of British India. He was the sixth son of Alexander Lawrence, an army officer, and was born on the 4th of March, 1811. He got his education at various places including Haileybury and joined service

under the British East India Company in 1829 when he was still in his teens. He worked in various civil capacities at different places in northern India. He was assistant to the Resident at Delhi, a magistrate and a collector at Panipat and Gurgaon respectively, a settlement officer at Etah and a civil judge at Delhi. During this period he acquainted himself thoroughly with the revenue systems in India and by his sympathetic attitude and affection for the people he greatly endeared himself with them. When the British defeated the Sikhs in the first Anglo-Sikh War in 1846 and annexed the Doab between the rivers Sutlej and Beas, Lord Hardinge appointed him as a commissioner to administer the acquired territories. After the annexation of the whole of the Punjab in 1849 he became its Chief Commissioner. In 1857, when the people all over northern India rose against the British authority, it was a tough time for Lawrence to keep his areas quiet. However, he proved himself equal to the task. He not only saved the Punjab from joining hands with the rebels but also enlisted the support of all the important native chiefs and common soldiers for the Government. It was chiefly due to him that the British could recapture the city of Delhi from Bahadur Shah, the last Mughal Emperor, who had become a rallying point for the rebels and had declared himself as the sovereign of India. Lord Canning complimented him for his services during this critical time in one of his despatches to the Home Government. John Lawrence was obliged to return to England due to his ill-health in 1858. He was accorded a hero's welcome. He stayed in England for five years. Once he was offered the governorship of Bombay but he declined. On the death of Lord Elgin in 1863, the British Government offered him the viceroyalty of India which he accepted.

Unlike his predecessors, Lord Lawrence was fully conversant with different languages of northern India and the affairs of the State. He took up the reins of the Government in the beginning of 1864. The people gave him a rousing reception at Calcutta. It was really a great credit to him that being a member of the Indian Civil Service he was elevated to the high office of the Viceroy. Some of the officers who were senior to him in service, however, became jealous.

The viceroyalty of Lord Lawrence, unlike the earlier periods of his service in India, was not very outstanding. He did not have any important achievement during this period. The Government was busy in rehabilitating the administration, which had been shaken to

its very foundations by the rislog of 1857. This has led some writers to remark that it would have been better if he had died the death of a hero fighting in the struggle for the cause of his country, like his brother Sir Henry Lawrence. He had to encounter rivalries of some of the members of his Council and the jealousy of some top ranking officers. Press was equally critical of his work and of his simple life, devoid of all formal pomp and show expected of a viceroy. However, the common people were happy with him. The Home Government was equally enthusiastic about his appointment and the Duke of Argyll went to the extent of remarking that if he had refused the viceroyalty of India, as he had earlier refused the governorship of Bombay, it would have been a great public misfortune. Lord Lawrence did not observe any formalities expected of a viceroy in his dealings with the public. He moved about freely at public places, went to the church without taking adequate guard and went minutely through the routine of his day-to-day life. Unlike his predecessors. He observed strict economy in the upkeep of his personal establishment. It led to a great criticism both by the Press and his colleagues who expected him to be more formal.

Lord Lawrence was helped in the administration of the State by the Imperial Council. Sir Charles Trevelyan was the Finance Member; Robert Napier was the Military Member; Sir Henry Maine the Legal Member; William Grey and H.B. Harington represented the Civil side and Rose, who had distinguished himself in the wars against Rani of Jhansi and Tantia Tope, was the commander-in-chief of the British forces. Lord Lawrence did not keep good health. Therefore, he requested the Home Government to make Simla as the summer capital of British India. The Secretary of State allowed him to stay at Simla during the summer but refused to make it a permanent feature.

Lord Lawrence had differences with Sir Hugh Rose, the commander-in-chief, over the administration of the army. While Sir Hugh Rose wanted that he should be responsible for every matter concerning the army, Lord Lawrence was of the opinion that the commander-in-chief was responsible for the discipline of the army and other problems should have the approval of the viceroy who would also deal with the posting of various regiments at different places. Lord Lawrence also had a difficult time with Sir Bartle Frere, the Governor of Bombay. These differences, however, were

only official. In his personal capacity he always maintained cordial relations with him. When the latter was decorated with the order of the Star of India, the Viceroy hastened to congratulate him.

Even though Lord Lawrence did not like to exhibit any pomp and show in the performance of the duties of his office, he knew that the British prestige in India could be restored not only by providing a good administration but also by impressing upon the people the grandeur of the Government to which the Indians had been accustomed from the very beginning. Therefore, he held Durbars at various places at which he invited the chiefs of different states. One of these was held at Lahore in October 1864 in which all the important nobles of northern India participated. About six hundred chiefs from the N.W. Frontier Province, Jammu and Kashmir and different parts of the Punjab participated in this impressive ceremony. The welcome address was delivered by Sir Robert Montgomery, the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, who was an old school-mate of Lord Lawrence. The Viceroy spoke in Hindustani, which was very much appreciated by the people. The Chief of Kapurthala was invested with the 'Star of India'. Other chiefs were advised to improve their administration and thereby win a privileged position in the eyes of the British Government by their sincerity to the paramount power and to the affairs of their states. Another such Durbar was held at Agra in November, 1865. Besides the chiefs of Rajputana and Bundelkhand, several Maratha chiefs also participated in it. The rulers of Karauli and Jodhpur were invested with the titles of the Knight Grand Cross of the Star of India at an impressive ceremony. Many other chiefs also got distinctions.

We may next turn to the internal policy of Lord Lawrence. The Permanent Settlement of the land revenues of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa made by Lord Cornwallis had meant the handing over of the lands of these three provinces to the landlords at a fixed rent, which could not be varied at a later date. Lord Cornwallis also had not made any provision to safeguard the interests of the tenants, who, in many areas, had so far enjoyed more rights over these lands than the landlords did. This led to an unrest all over the three provinces and the Government had to deal with this problem at a later date by enacting several legislative measures. Lord Lawrence was determined to redress the wrongs done to the tenants who were weak and had no voice. They had been suffering under very trying circumstances for more than half a century. With the cooperation of the Press and

the British officers, the landlords had virtually made it impossible for any Governor General to improve the lot of the tenants. When Lord Lawrence took up their cause, he was confronted with an enormous opposition. His biographer writes, "Almost alone, Sir John Lawrence undertook the cause of the weak and the oppressed, against the united influence of the native aristocracy, of the planters, of the Press, of a portion of his council, of Secretary of State at home and of the European element generally in India." Against this formidable opposition Lord Lawrence could not achieve a complete success. He, however, succeeded in making a compromise with the landed aristocracy and secured as many concessions for the tenants as he could possibly get. A rent law had been passed in 1859 during the viceroyalty of Lord Canning, according to which a landlord could not increase the rent of the land or eject the tenant. These two concessions, i.e., a fixed rent and security from eviction, greatly relieved the tenants. On the other hand, planters and landlords had represented that they should be given some protection against their tenants, and had, as a result, secured from the Government a kind of contract, according to which a tenant could be imprisoned for non-payment of loan and rent. The tenant, who was forced to sign the contract, was always at a disadvantage and at the mercy of a landlord who used all sorts of coercive measures to extract the last pice out of him. Lord Lawrence explained to the landlords that the Government wanted to protect the tenants, because, they, and not the landlords, were the weaker party. He argued that coercive measures might one day lead to complete extinction of the tenant class. This would also be a disadvantage to the landlords, who depended upon the tenants. While he admitted that the tenants evaded payments at times and were also clever in their own way, at the same time he did not hesitate to tell the landlords frankly that they were equally greedy and oppressive in their dealing with the tenants. His resolute stand forced the landlords to agree, after a lot of opposition, to a compromise, by which the tenants obtained security of tenure and were required to pay a fair rent.

After this, Lord Lawrence turned his attention towards Oudh, where the problem of tenancy was still more complicated. After the rising of 1857, Lord Canning, by his revenue settlement of this province, had declared the Tnukdars as the rightful owners of the land. They had virtually become the controllers and the owners of the lands. Lord Canning had not bothered to deal with the root cause of the

problem. His settlement of the question was based on the ownership records of these lands during the past decade when the British took over the administration from the Nawab. These Talukdars had become the owners of the land only a few years before the British took over the administration, taking advantage of the maladministration of the latter Nawabs. The real owners of these lands at several places were some other persons. Unfortunately, Charles Wingfield, who had taken over the administration of Oudh after the rising of 1857, was a more enthusiastic supporter of the Talukdars than even Lord Canning. He was not prepared to listen to anybody who spoke in favour of the intermediaries or the smaller zamindars, who in reality, had a better right over the lands than the Talukdars. Under the new arrangements there were only two classes: the Talukdars who were the land owners, and the tenants-at-will, who enjoyed the tenure of land completely at the will of the Talukdars. Fortunately, for the intermediaries there was a clause in the settlement which has thus been quoted by Lord Irwin in his book 'Garden of India', "that you will, to the best of your power, try to promote the agricultural resources of your estate, and that, whatever holders of subordinate rights may be under you, will be secure in the possession of those rights". Taking advantage of this, when Lord Lawrence appointed Henry Davies to look into the claims of the Talukdars versus intermediaries, there was a great hue and cry both in the Press and among the rich classes. The Talukdars were determined to resist the action of the Government. This unrest did not remain a secret even from the Home Government and the Viceroy got a strong letter from the Secretary of the State in the matter. But he remained cool and thus replied to Sir Charles Wood, the Secretary of State: "I have no wish to harm the Talukdars, on the contrary I desire to see fair-play to their interest." The determined tone of the Viceroy made the Talukdars more flexible in their attitude towards the Government. Through the intercession of Sir John Strachey, the Chief Commissioner of Oudh, a compromise was reached by which the Government confirmed the rights of the Talukdars on their respective lands and secured, for such cultivators, as had enjoyed proprietary rights earlier, a "secure" land tenure and a fair rent. The biographer of Lord Lawrence writes about this compromise, "that Government should create no new rights, and on the other, that the privileges which, practically, gave fixity of tenure, should, in the case of all cultivators

who had been originally proprietors, be confirmed and secured by law. More important still, it was agreed that cultivators should be entitled, on the raising of their rent, to compensation for what would be called in England 'unexhausted improvement, nor could the rent be raised except by application to a court of law and equity."

Lord Lawrence next turned his attention to the land problem of the Punjab. He held an enquiry into the rights of the Jagirdars, landlords and the cultivators and regulated the whole system. W.S. Seton Kar wrote about this Act: "The act regulated and defined the position of tenants with rights of occupancy; it protected them against enhancement, except under peculiar conditions, it recognised their power to alienate their tenures; it limited the privilege of pre-emption and gave the option to the landlord; and, with an almost prophetic apprehension of the points at issue in Ireland, it defined the improvements which might be made by the tenant and specified the compensation which he might look to receive." Although this legislation helped only those of the tenants who had enjoyed the proprietary rights earlier but the movement helped them to get more concessions during the period of his successors.

Lord Lawrence was equally determined to put down any internal unrest. He did not hesitate to interfere, in the affairs of the subordinate States, whenever he found a ruler mis-managing his state. He gave up the earlier policy of Subordinate Isolation and considered the people in the native States as British subjects. He deposed the ruler of Tonk, when it was brought to his notice that the latter had murdered about fourteen persons in his state without any justification.

During the period of Lord Lawrence a famine broke out in Orissa. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal did not adopt relief measures in time and under-estimated the gravity of the situation. He also did not inform the Governor General about the true state of affairs. The result was that about a million people died.

The disaster caused by the famine was mainly due to inadequate system for transporting food to the affected areas. It necessitated the taking up of the schemes of extending the net-work of railways and roads to the remote parts of the country. The irrigation works were also taken up. But the Home Government was not sympathetic and the request of the Governor General for the

grant of a loan for these "unremunerative" schemes, as these were thought, was not given a favourable consideration. On the contrary, the Home Government planned the building of a road from Rangoon to West China. Still, Lord Lawrence extended the activities of the Public Works Department to different parts of the country and carried out surveys to implement several irrigation works.

He invited the private enterprise to help the Government in the construction of irrigation projects like the building of tanks, weirs and canals. He also encouraged the people to invest their money in the extension of the roads and railways. Within the period of his tenure of five years, 1556 miles of railway lines were added at a cost of thirty million Sterling. Bridges on Yamuna and Sone rivers were built. Telegraphic service was extended to another 22,567 miles and a uniform rate of one rupee was fixed for a telegram directed to any part of the country. He looked into the management of the forests and appointed Inspectors-General and other staff in every province to ensure better forest resources. He encouraged private bodies to open new schools in their areas. Several schools were also opened for the girls. About fiftyfour thousand girls were admitted in the two thousand schools opened for them. There were about seven lakh children in the nineteen thousand schools and colleges.

In the sphere of external affairs he had to deal with Theodore, the Abyssinian King, who had imprisoned some Englishmen and refused to release them. Sir Robert Napier, the commander-in-chief of the Bombay forces, was sent with an army against him. The ruler was defeated and committed suicide. Lord Lawrence requested the Home Government to bear the expenditure of this expedition, which had not been undertaken in the Indian interests. The Home Government did not agree. Therefore, the burden fell upon the Indian exchequer,

Bhutan, a small principality on the northern borders of India, ruled by a temporal and a religious head, was parcelled into several small chiefdoms. The people of Bhutan had been violating the border and Lord Elgin, the predecessor of Lord Lawrence, had sent a mission, led by Ashley Edon, to Punakha, the capital of the State. But there was a revolution in Bhutan and the power was usurped by one, Tongso Penlow, who did not treat the mission

properly and after insulting the British envoy forced him to sign a treaty under which the British were required to hand over the territories of Doab to the Government of Bhutan. There was a great hue and cry against this treatment. Lord Lawrence, despatched an army to punish the ruler of Bhutan. The territories of Bengal and Doab were captured and the annual grant of Rs. 12,000, which was earlier given to the rulers of Bhutan, was stopped. Tongso Penlow retaliated and recaptured the territories in the beginning of 1865. Lord Lawrence, therefore, was obliged to send another army under General Tombs, who defeated the Bhutanese forces and forced the ruler to cede the territories of Bengal and Doab to the British Government. The grant of Rupees twelve thousand a year to the rulers of Bhutan was henceforth made conditional to the good behaviour of the ruler.

The ruler of Mysore had been deposed for his misadministration some time earlier. The question arose whether, after the death of the ruler, the State should be governed by the British as before, or handed over to the son of the deposed ruler. The Governor General postponed the decision till the death of the ruler stating that the question of succession would be determined by taking into account the capability of the successor.

Lord Lawrence followed what is known as the "Policy of Masterly Inactivity" in his relations with the neighbouring State of Afghanistan. The growing influence of Russia in Central Asia had always been an eyesore to the British statesmen in India. Lord Auckland had exaggerated the importance of the Russian danger and in a bid to save Afghanistan from falling under the influence of Russia, he had marched his forces against the Afghan ruler, when the latter refused to be guided by the British Government in his foreign policy. The war proved to be very costly and the British Government had to retrace its steps from that country after suffering a loss of twenty-two thousand lives and several million pounds. Lord Lawrence knew that the British had already gone beyond the limits of their resources in India and could not, therefore, afford to extend their territories further in the North-West. It was impolitic to pursue a forward and aggressive policy in this direction. He held that the best course open was to strengthen the existing North-Western borders and help in the establishment of a strong and peaceful Government in Afghanistan accompanied

by an agreement between Russia and England demarcating the sphere of influence of each Government. This policy of Lord Lawrence proved to be very advantageous in the long run. It was known by his admirers as the "Policy of Masterly Inactivity". This does not mean that Lord Lawrence was blind to the developments in the North-West. On several occasions he cautioned the Indian Government to be watchful of its defences in this area but his policy has been criticised by some writers who think that this policy of inactivity was neither masterly nor a far-sighted one. It may, however, be pointed out that the Russian danger had been increasing steadily for the last fifty years. They had established their influence in the countries of Bukhara, Khiva and Khokand and were gradually extending their sway over Meru. The Persians too were virtually under their sway. The first Afghan War had been fought fundamentally on this issue of the growing influence of the Russians. But nothing had been gained as a result of it. Lord Lawrence, therefore, rightly decided that the British should not extend their boundaries as it would involve them in more troubles and increase their responsibilities for which they did not have adequate resources. Another group of writers, led by General John Jacob, who had considerable experience of the North-Western frontiers, holds that the British should have extended their boundaries still further. They should not only have developed Quetta as one of their bases to control Kandahar and Herat but should also have kept their agent in Afghanistan, who might keep them informed about the political developments in that country. Lord Lawrence, however, did not favour this forward policy. According to him, this would have created a suspicion in the minds of the Afghans and would not only have converted them into the enemies of the British but would also have given the Russians an chance to exploit the situation. Lord Lawrence was right in thinking that the Afghans always treated the first foreigner in their country as an enemy and the second as a saviour. The occupation of Afghanistan or any further extension of the British frontiers could only have increased their liabilities and forced the British Government to maintain an occupation army in the extended frontier areas resulting in a lot of expenditure without any gain. The Western border, inherited by the British from the Sikhs, was the best natural boundary and was very well-linked with the hinterland. Strengthening of these borders was comparatively very cheap and also could not be resented either by the Afghans or

by any other nation. Lord Lawrence wanted the British Government to inform the Afghan ruler frankly that it had no mind to interfere in his internal affairs or to keep a resident at his court and that money and material aid would be given to him as and when the British considered it necessary. The British Government should not commit anything in writing to any party in Afghanistan but should always be interested in seeing Afghanistan a prosperous country and its people an independent and strong nation. The British Government, however, should not tolerate the interference of any foreign power in the Afghan affairs and discourage the Afghan ruler developing political relations with other European powers. Lord Lawrence also assured the Afghan ruler that the British Government would use its good offices to stop any unprovoked aggression on his country and would not hesitate to send help in the shape of troops and money. The British forces, however, would evacuate Afghanistan after vacating the aggression. The policy of Lord Lawrence was mainly based on the sound advice given to him by Dost Mohammad, the ruler of Afghanistan, in the course of a meeting. The Afghan ruler had told him frankly that the Afghans resented interference of any foreign power in their internal affairs as they dearly loved their independence. Lord Lawrence appreciated this advice and never ignored it when dealing with the Afghans.

Dost Mohammed died in June 1863, leaving behind several claimants, the most important being Sher Ali, Mohammed Afzal and Mohammed Azam, who started fighting among themselves for the throne. Dost Mohammed had nominated Sher Ali as his successor but he knew that this nomination would not carry any weight and that a successful successor would have to prove himself to be the fittest among his rivals. Some people in India and in England considered that the British Government in India should take advantage of this disturbed situation in Afghanistan, and by taking up the cause of one particular prince in the war of succession, extend the British influence over that country. They, however, did not realise that the Afghans would never acknowledge a prince as their ruler if he came out successful with the help of the British army. They completely forgot the fate of Shah Shuja, who, although successful, had not even been saluted by a common man of his country on his accession to the throne of Afghanistan with the help of the British and the Sikhs. The war of succession went on for

five years and in the end Sher Ali was successful. Lord Lawrence followed a policy of complete neutrality and thus saved India from undertaking a costly expedition to support a particular candidate. During this period of five years, Sher Ali, Mohammed Afzal and Mohammed Azam came into power successively and were successively recognised as rulers by Lord Lawrence. This was resented by the Afghan princes and they protested against this policy of Lord Lawrence.

The Biographer of Lord Lawrence has thus described the character of Sher Ali, "He was a saul, in his commanding aspect, in his generous impulses, in his warm affection, in his brooding melancholy, in his mad jealousy, in his outbursts of ferocity against those whom he loved most dearly, finally, in that ineffable dignity, which a long train of calamities that are only half-merited, seldom fails to confer upon a man who has aught that is noble in his character or his antecedents." When Sher Ali was supreme at Kabul, Afzal wrote from Herat that he was ready to conclude an alliance with the British Government against Russia if the British supported his candidature to the throne of Afghanistan. Lord Lawrence replied to him that the British Government could deal only with the reigning monarch at Kabul. The policy of Lord Lawrence was faithfully followed by Lord Mayo and Lord Northbrook who succeeded him. The Home Government not only approved of it but also commended it as a very sane policy.

Once or twice Home Government sounded Lord Lawrence to adopt a forward policy in view of the growing danger of Russia but the former refused to depart from his policy. However, he requested the Home Government to make it clear to the Russian Government that England was interested in Afghanistan's neutrality and would not tolerate the influence of any foreign power in that country. The Home Government took up the hint and the Secretary of State in one of his speeches in the House of Commons openly admitted the British interest in Afghanistan.

Lord Lawrence retired in January, 1869 and was given a farewell on the 11th of that month by his successor Lord Mayo as well as the important civil and military officers.

Lord Lawrence was a pacifist but he never hesitated to go in for a war if the British honour was at stake or there was some in-

justice. He held that the Government should try to avoid complications and devote itself to reconstruction and consolidation of its power in India which had been adversely affected in 1857. The war was a costly affair and a great burden on the Indian budget which the Government could ill-afford. He believed in an efficient government which could take into consideration all the economy measures, which should be well-established and which should be respected for its justice and strength. In his foreign policy Lord Lawrence proved to be very successful. But his domestic policy was not so much of a success. No doubt his land reforms won him applause and the love of the peasants but his delay in taking relief measures for the famine-stricken people of Orissa evoked a lot of criticism. It is painful to note that he held Durbars at Lahore and Agra and spent lavishly on these occasions while the people in southern India and Orissa died in large numbers due to starvation. He also could not introduce any significant reforms. As compared to his career as a Chief Commissioner in the Punjab his achievement as a Viceroy is practically nil. Captain Trotter has thus summarised his career: "His sterling honesty, his sound judgment, his large heart, and his right experience gave their full liverage to that ingrained love of justice, rarest of all manly virtues, which Lord Lawrence displayed so strikingly in every passage of his public career". Lord Lawrence died on the 26th July, 1879 at London at the age of 68.

THE EARL OF MAYO (1869—1872)

Lord Mayo succeeded Lord Lawrence as the British Viceroy in India in January, 1869. He was born in Dublin on the 21st of February, 1822. He received his early education privately and took his degree from Trinity College, Dublin. He became a Member of Parliament in 1847 and attended the sessions of Parliament for a long period of 21 years. He was a member of the Tory party, but, unlike his other colleagues, he was of a liberal outlook. Disraeli and other Tories felt irritated whenever he took a liberal view of any problem of the State. One of his colleagues wrote about him: "He was not entirely a conservative of his own day; neither was he a liberal according to the tenets of the Liberal Party of his time." He was a broad-minded politician who did not feel the necessity of belonging to one party. He was not much interested in different problems of the State which came up before the Parliament. How-

ever, he took a very lively interest in the affairs of Ireland. He was considered an authority on Ireland and whenever the Tories were in power he held the post of Chief Secretary for Ireland. He had a very soft corner for the poor, the depressed and the aggrieved and was always ready to redress their grievances. He had a great affection for Ireland and, when leaving for India, he left a will that after his death he should be buried in the church-yard of his own estate in Ireland. In his personal life he was a great sportsman and fond of country life. He was very humorous and had jovial manners. His friends were very fond of his company. Unfortunately, his work was not appreciated and he was so much fed up with the political life in England that he gladly accepted the viceroyalty of India.

Like his predecessors, Lord Mayo had an Executive Council to assist him in administration. Its members were in charge of different departments. Lord Mayo retained the Public Works Department with himself but he kept himself fully informed about the activities of other departments. His attention and scrutiny of the work of the administration led to several reforms in its working. He also enforced economy, as the budgets of all the previous years had been showing deficit. He held the view that the Government had no justification to have deficit budgets during peace time. Unlike his predecessors, he was against red-tapism.

We may have now an examination of various administrative reforms introduced by Lord Mayo. First of all he took up the budget. A close examination revealed that the deficit in the previous years' budgets was due more to the defective financial system than any other reason. The reports prepared by the State Governments about different schemes relating to their armed forces had not been properly scrutinised and they showed a much larger expenditure than it actually was. The Government was also burdened with a large public debt which had been accumulating since the rising of 1857. It stood at £193 million when Lord Mayo took over. Of this, £102 million had been spent on military expeditions and the rest on public works. A study of the budgets of the previous fifty-five years presented a very gloomy picture. Only in sixteen years there had been a surplus in the budget. Lord Mayo gave his personal attention to the whole problem and it may be said to his credit that during all the four years of his tenure there was always a surplus budget. At the

same time, his economy had no adverse effect on various plans and schemes he had inherited from his predecessor. To give effect to his policy Lord Mayo introduced three reforms. Firstly, he laid great stress on the preparation of a very correct estimate of all the schemes. Secondly, he made it a point to see that there was no wastage of the Government funds on any scheme or plan. Thirdly, he effected retrenchment both in the civil and military services. He raised the rate of incometax from 1 per cent to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Central machinery for preparation of budget was reformed and instructions were sent to the local Governments to prepare accurate and economical budgets. Lord Mayo also directed the State Governments to send their estimates of different schemes well in time so that the Central Government could have sufficient time to scrutinise them. They were also asked to submit monthly reports of their expenditure on different schemes, the estimates of which had already been approved by the Central Government. They were also asked to intimate to the Central Government only their urgent demands which could not be postponed. It was also enjoined upon them that they should remain within the limits of their estimated expenditure and surrender the savings to the Central Government. The biographer of Lord Mayo has given a detailed picture of the four budgets passed during his period as below :—

Year	Revenue	Ordinary Expenditure	Remarks
1868-69	£ 51,657,658	£ 54,431,698	Year of deficit preceding Lord Mayo's rule.
1869-70	£ 50,901,081	£ 50,782,413	Year of Equi- librium ; his first year of office.
1870-71	£ 51,413,685	£ 49,930,695	} Years of sur- plus ; his last two years of office.
1871-72	£ 50,109,093	£ 46,984,915	

From a study of these budgets it becomes clear that Lord Mayo was quite successful in his financial policy. The Government revenues did not increase which indicated that Government did not like to increase the burden of taxation. There was an accurate preparation of the State budgets, a systematic scrutiny by the Central Government and maintenance of up-to-date reports both by the State and the Central Government.

Lord Mayo also introduced some military reforms. When the Indian Sepoys rose in 1857 against the British Government their strength as compared to the European soldiers was 5 : 1. The British Government had suffered a lot due to this disparity in numbers and had disbanded several native regiments. The number of native soldiers had thus been reduced to one-half of their number before the Mutiny. The number of the British soldiers, however, had increased. When Lord Mayo took over, there were 1,33,358 native soldiers and 61,942 British soldiers. As compared to the Indian soldiers the British soldiers drew a very high salary. While an Indian Sepoy was paid only Rs. 7/- per month, a British soldier got about Rs. 45/- per month. Therefore, the Government Expenditure on the army had increased although its strength as compared to the year 1857 was smaller. Lord Mayo wanted to reduce this expenditure by about £1½ million but he also did not want to reduce the present strength of the army. A close examination of the records of different regiments revealed that many of them did not have complete strength. On paper, therefore, their strength could be reduced by the number their actual strength fell short of their sanctioned strength. This neither reduced the number of soldiers nor did it adversely affect the administration. But this helped the Government to reduce the expenditure on the army which was based on the sanctioned strength. Lord Mayo was in favour of reducing the number of the native regiments in Bengal and the Presidencies of Bombay and Madras. He sent his recommendations to the Home Government. The Secretary of State, however, did not wholly agree to his recommendations although the latter complimented him by saying that: "His object was to reduce that was superfluous in the army, but not to starve what was essential. While Lord Mayo was in favour of reducing the superfluous expenditure he was very liberal while spending on the material improvement of the people". He improved the working of the hospitals and looked into their sanitary arrangements. In one of his despatches to the Secretary of State he wrote that he did not want to get a single farthing more from the people for the maintenance of the army than was absolutely essential for the defence of the country.

Lord Mayo also looked into the administration of different provinces. In order to acquaint himself with their affairs he undertook an extensive tour of the country. He appreciated the work of the intelligent and hard working officers and suggested improvement,

where essential. He held that the public works were not properly supervised and that the majority of the senior officers did not show much interest in the various schemes. He was against the system of getting the works executed through the contract system. The State Governments were instructed to avoid borrowing of money for the execution of such schemes as were not emergent or productive. He held that the development and expansion of railways and irrigation works would reduce chances of famines; thereby saving thousands of valuable lives. He showed much more interest in primary education—the means of educating the masses than in higher education, which was restricted only to a few. Accordingly, several new primary schools were opened in which about 1½ lakhs children received education in lower Bengal in 1870. Unfortunately, the Muslims were hostile towards the western system of education. Lord Mayo introduced special concessions for them to attract them to the western education.

Lord Mayo did a commendable job in regard to the reforms of prisons. At that time conditions prevailing in the prisons left much to be desired. There was lack of sanitation and unhygienic conditions prevailed which resulted in the death of about 10% of the prisoners. Lord Mayo wanted perfect discipline in the jails but he also wanted special medical attention to be given to the prisoners. He also showed interest in the well-being of the life-long prisoners in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. Hitherto they were a burden on the State exchequer as no useful work was done by them. It was now planned that cultivation should be undertaken with the help of these prisoners. This produced good results and, after a few years, instead of being a burden they became an asset to the Government. It was estimated that after deducting the expenses on their maintenance, there was a surplus of £13,000 in a year. After his tour of Burma Lord Mayo himself went to Andaman Islands. Unfortunately, one of the prisoners who belonged to the Frontier province and was engaged as a barber there stabbed him fatally. He was brought to Calcutta from where he was taken to Ireland. He died on the 8th of February, 1872.

The policy of the Government of India towards the Indian States, which had accepted their overlordship through the subsidiary alliances, had so far been that of a subordinate isolation. The British always wanted these States to be governed by incapable rulers, supported by incapable officers so that they should become unpopular

with the people and always remain weak. Lord Dalhousie had applied his 'Doctrine of Lapse' to these States and made some annexations. It is, no doubt, true that the rising of 1857 had failed but the British Government could not ignore the disaffection created by their earlier indifferent policy towards the people which had led to it. The British Government had also to change its attitude in view of the loyalty of the rulers of these States during the stormy days of 1857. The rulers of these States had come to their rescue in spite of the opposition of their own armed forces which rose against them. The British Government, therefore, revised its policy to that of subordinate cooperation. In the declaration of 1858 the Queen gave an assurance to the native rulers that they would be allowed to adopt successors whenever their natural heirs failed. They were no longer to be considered as isolated and were to be treated at par with the British subjects. As a result of this declaration, the British viceroys started taking interest in the welfare of the residents of these native States. Thus, throughout his vicereignty, Lord Mayo tried to reconcile the people. He told the native rulers that the British Government had no intention to interfere in their internal affairs and enjoined upon them to take interest in the welfare of their subjects, to provide a good administration and to introduce popular reforms. It was explained to them that it was in their interest to keep their people happy and satisfied and that a strong government and a prosperous state were both in the interest of the ruler and the ruled. They were assured that if they complied with these requirements, the British Government would never think of annexing their States. While Lord Mayo showed all regards for the Begum of Bhopal who had become popular with her people by the introduction of several reforms in her State, he did not hesitate to write a strong letter to the ruler of Udaipur when it was reported that the latter was not taking interest in the affairs of the State and had let loose a tyrannical rule. Lord Mayo also interfered in the affairs of the State of Alwar when he learnt that the ruler was wasting public money on his pleasures and was always sunk in the company of the low-born and flatterers. The ruler was deposed in favour of a council, presided over by a British political agent. He was pensioned off but given an assurance that his State would be restored to him if he convinced the Government that he had reformed himself.

The North-Western borders of India had always been a head-ache to the British Government in India. Afghanistan had just

recovered from turmoil, anarchy and disorder of about five years since the death of its able monarch, Dost Mohammed. Baluchistan was also in a state of anarchy and disorder and a struggle for supremacy was going on between its ruler and the chiefs of the different clans. Another trouble-spot was the newly established state of Turkistan which had declared its independence under a Muslim chief and had broken off its connections with the Empire of China. The British Government feared that Russia intended marching down the Indian borders, taking advantage of the disturbed conditions in Afghanistan and Turkistan. Similarly, the internal quarrels of the Baluchis had given a chance to the Government of Persia to extend its sway in the East. Lord Lawrence, the predecessor of Lord Mayo, had all along followed a policy of masterly inactivity in regard to the North-Western borders. He did not interfere in the affairs of Afghanistan, Baluchistan or Turkistan. Rather, he laid more stress on the strengthening of the Indian borders and the establishment of a strong government in the country. This indifference on the part of the British Government led to estrangement of its relations with Afghanistan where Sher Ali came out successful in the war of succession. Before his departure Lord Lawrence had congratulated Sher Ali on his success and had asked him to arrange for a meeting. Sher Ali visited India during the period of Lord Mayo and was given a befitting reception at Ambala. Lord Mayo had no intention to give up the policy followed by his predecessor. But Sher Ali wanted a definite alliance and requested the British to give him a firm under-taking that they would lend their support only to him and his heirs and would help them with money and material as and when they required it. For this help he was ready to abide by the directions of the British Government in regard to his foreign relations. A viceroy like Lord Lytton would have been happy to agree. But Lord Mayo was against this policy. While he tried to impress upon Sher Ali the sincerity of the British friendship and desire to lend him moral support, he was not willing to commit his Government in any way. He told him that the British Government would help him with money and material but the time when this help was to be given was always to be determined by the British Government. Lord Mayo refused to be a party to support the claims of Sher Ali or to acknowledge the claims of his favourite child, Abdulla

Jan, as his successor, in preference to Yaqub Khan, his eldest son. The Viceroy advised the Afghan ruler to give a good administration to his people, to pay his officers in cash and not to revive the Jagir system. After this interview, Lord Mayo wrote to the Home Government that the Afghan ruler had returned to his capital well satisfied. This was only partially true. Sher Ali did appreciate the honour and the sound advice given to him but he was not blind to the fact that he had not been able to achieve any of his objects.

Lord Mayo wanted to adopt a conciliatory policy towards Russia also. He considered it unwise to attempt to check the Russian advance in Central Asia and also to shut his eyes to the growing Russian influence in those regions. He, like his predecessor, favoured a formal understanding between the Russian and the British Governments on the questions of Asian regions. His policy was successful on the whole and on several occasions he was able to arrive at an informal understanding with the Russians.

He was, however, not so successful in his intervention in the struggle for supremacy between the ruler of Baluchistan and his chiefs. Both the rival parties tried to convince the Viceroy of the legitimacy of their respective claims. But unfortunately neither of the sides had any legal claim. The position differed from ruler to ruler. If a ruler was strong, he ruled independently without the interference of his nobles. If, however, the nobles were powerful and the ruler was weak, the Government was run on the advice of the nobles. Lord Mayo appointed an arbitrator, acceptable to both the parties, to look into their respective claims. This did not lead to any concrete solution. The only result was that a boundary line between Persia and Baluchistan was drawn.

The Government of China had extended its sway to the north of Kashmir. Majority of the people living in the Gobi desert were Muslims. They revolted against the Chinese and, under one Yakub Kushbeghi, they established an independent government in 1869 and turned out the Chinese Officers.

However, they were afraid lest the Chinese should invade their country at some later date. Therefore, they wanted to stabilise their position by exchanging agents with the neighbouring States. In January 1870, the chief of these regions, which were now known as Eastern Turkistan, sent an envoy to India and desired to have both political and commercial alliance with the Indian Government. Lord

Mayo despatched Douglas Forsyth to Eastern Turkistan to report on the various aspects of the country before any political understanding could be reached. On his return to India the British envoy did not give an encouraging report. The proposal was, therefore, dropped.

Lord Mayo was assassinated on the 8th of February, 1872 when he was on a tour to Andaman Islands. Both the Queen of England and his colleagues had a very high opinion of him. The Queen described him as an able, vigilant, and martial man. Lord Derby, one of his colleagues, considered him as a man of generous, humorous and liberal views.

EARL OF NORTHBROOK (1872—1876)

Lord Northbrook succeeded Lord Mayo in May, 1872 as the British Viceroy in India. He was the eldest son of Sir Francis Baring and was born on the 22nd of January, 1826 in London. He received his early education privately and then joined Christ College. Although he was not a brilliant speaker or a politician, he entered Parliament in 1857. He worked as an under Secretary first to Charles Wood, and then to Gladstone. He was selected as the British Viceroy for India by the Liberal Ministry of Gladstone as soon as the news of assassination of Lord Mayo reached England. Lord Northbrook was already acquainted with the Indian affairs. Therefore, he did not experience much difficulty on taking over the charge of his Indian assignment. There was peace and prosperity all round. The people were happy as the financial reforms of Lord Mayo had greatly increased the British esteem. Lord Northbrook did not change the policy of his predecessor and continued the work of reconstruction. Like his predecessor he held Darbars and went on prolonged tours of the country. During these tours he familiarised himself with the various problems of the state needing his urgent attention and also came into close contact with the native rulers.

To meet the growing expenses of the State on the public works Lord Mayo had imposed an income-tax. This was very unpopular among the masses. Lord Northbrook, therefore, abolished it in the budget for 1873-74. In spite of this concession it was a surplus budget. In that very year crops failed in many parts of the country due to the scarcity of rainfall and it was feared that Bengal would face another famine. The Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, therefore,

sent an urgent warning to the Viceroy who was then at Simla. Lord Northbrook took effective relief measures immediately. He sent very strict instructions to the officers in the various parts of the country that any lapse on their part would be dealt with very severely. Lord Northbrook also solicited the cooperation and help of the people, particularly the rich and the business community. The people were requested to economise and to avoid wastage of food grains. A systematic assessment of the requirements of the people was made. Rice was imported from Burma where there had been a bumper crop that year. All these measures of the Government and the personal attention of the Viceroy greatly mitigated the baneful effects of the famine. Next year, there was a good rainfall and the people returned to their homes. The Government did have a deficit in its budget on this account but the Viceroy had the consolation of knowing that nobody had died due to starvation. The famine made the people and the Government keener in the construction of roadways, canals and the railways and many more people came forward to invest money in this constructive work.

In the budget of 1875 Lord Northbrook made further reductions in the various taxes and except the customs duty on Rice, Indigo, and Lac, duties on all other articles were abolished. In spite of these reductions the budget was a surplus one.

Lord Northbrook took interest in the spread of education among the common people. Several new schools were opened. Thousands of new books were published. The number of the school-going children increased appreciably and there was a considerable development in the field of education of the women. There was also an appreciable increase in the publication of the daily newspapers. Several new societies and social organisations sprang up which took keen interest in the political and social problems of the country.

An important event of the viceroyalty of Lord Northbrook was the visit of Prince of Wales in December, 1875 to India. He was given a grand reception at Calcutta, where all the important native rulers and chiefs had assembled. The Prince of Wales toured the country and visited places like Patna, Jammu and Kashmir, Rajputana and Central India. He was very much impressed by the sincerity and the regard shown to him by the rulers and chiefs.

Lord Northbrook did not want to interfere in the internal affairs of the native rulers. But he never hesitated to take strong

measures against a native ruler whom he found tyrannical or negligent in the welfare of his people. Malhar Rao Gaekward of Baroda had been charged with a murderous attempt on the life of the British resident Phayre as the latter had made an adverse report about his administration. Lord Northbrook immediately appointed a commission to hold an enquiry. As a result thereof the ruler was deposed, arrested and the new resident, Sir Lewis Peelly, was instructed to take charge of the government. A regency was set up to look after the administration till the new ruler Sayaji Rao took over the government. Sir Madhav Rao, who had a long record of meritorious service to his credit, was appointed as minister of the State. The State soon became prosperous. Some of the writers have considered the action of the Viceroy towards the ruler as too harsh since the Indian members of the commission had absolved Gaekward of all the responsibility of being a party in the nefarious attempt on the life of the resident.

Lord Northbrook followed in the foot-steps of his predecessors in regard to his foreign policy. Like Lord Lawrence and Lord Mayo he was of the opinion that the best security for the British possessions in India lay in a good administration within the country and a strong border policy rather than any active participation in the affairs of Afghanistan or other neighbouring countries. According to him, the best solution of the Middle East tangle was a clear demarcation of the sphere of influence between Great Britain and Russia. When he came to India the Russian advance towards the Middle East was becoming a constant head-ache to the British. The Khan of Khiva suspected the intentions of the Russians and did not maintain good relations with them. He sent an agent to the Viceroy, soliciting his help against the Russians but Lord Northbrook informed the envoy that the blame for the provocation lay on the Khan himself. However, when later on the Russians advanced towards Khiva in spite of their earlier assurances to the contrary, there was a great hue and cry both in India and England. But the two governments reached an amicable settlement and there was a restoration of peace. The Russians agreed not to advance beyond a certain boundary line in Badakshan laid down in 1873.

Amir Sher Ali of Afghanistan was not happy at the growing Russian influence near his borders. He suspected their intentions. He had tried to reach a firm understanding with the British Govern-

ment during the period of Lord Mayo. During his visit to Ambala he had requested the viceroy to make a definite commitment under which the British would under-take to help Sher Ali and his descendants against any foreign aggression or internal disturbance. In exchange, he was ready to be guided by the British in his foreign policy. Lord Mayo, however, had refused to make any such commitment. The growing danger of the Russians, therefore, was a constant head-ache to Sher Ali while his relations with the British were in a nebulous state. He was also not happy at the award given by the British arbitrator in his dispute with Persia about the borders near Seistan. He despatched Nur Mohammad Shah to Simla to sound the British Viceroy about his apprehensions. Lord Northbrook explained to the Afghan agent that the British Government would use its good offices to bring about a peaceful settlement in case there was a dispute between the Afghans and the Russians and would even help the Afghans with money and material if there was an unprovoked Russian attack on Afghanistan. It was, however, made clear to the agent that the help would be given only when the British Government deemed it fit. The idea behind this condition was to discourage him from committing an aggression under the garb of false apprehensions. Further, compensation of Rupees ten lakhs was also promised to the Afghan agent for the unfavourable Seistan award. A gift of fifteen thousand rifles was given in token of friendship. Last but not the least, Lord Northbrook assured the Afghan agent that the British Government had no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Sher Ali had desired some firm assurance and a British help against the Russians. But Lord Northbrook had refused to give any such assurance. Sher Ali felt a little estranged and refused to receive the compensation money of Rupees ten lakhs. Indirectly, he also made all possible efforts to obstruct the implementation of the Seistan Award. He refused to give a passage to Mr. Douglas Forsyth through Afghanistan for the latter's return from Turkistan and also to Colonel Baker for his return from Iran. Lord Northbrook felt the belligerent attitude of the Afghan ruler. Some writers, however, argue that Sher Ali did not allow a passage to the British mission returning from Turkistan because he could not guarantee their safety in his country. Any harm to them would have endangered his relations with the British. Therefore, he was frank enough to inform the Viceroy of his inability to help in the matter. Mr. Douglas Forsyth reached India via Wakhan whose chief was a

tributary of the Afghan ruler. The viceroy appreciated his help and sent him presents. This was, however, never brought to the notice of Sher Ali, who was justified in protesting against this dealing with one of his subordinate chiefs over his head.

Sher Ali owed his throne to the solid support of his eldest son Yaqub Khan but he showed preference to his youngest son Abdulla Jan. Ynqub Khan's patience was exhausted when Sher Ali declared Abdulla Jan as his heir-designate. Ynqub Khan was estranged and began harbouring designs of rebellion. Another civil war in the country was imminent. The father and the son, however, were apparently reconciled but when Yaqub Khan came to see his father, he was treacherously arrested and imprisoned. Lord Northbrook sent a note to Sher Ali, advising him to be fair towards Yaqub Khan. Sher Ali resented this interference in his internal affairs and although he did not give vent to his feelings openly, he was further estranged with Lord Northbrook.

Meanwhile, in England, the Conservatives had come into power. Lord Salisbury, the new Secretary of State for India, was more inclined to a 'forward policy' in Afghanistan. He was very much worried by the growing power of Russia in the north-west of Afghanistan and desired the British Government to have a definite alliance with the Afghan ruler. He, therefore, wrote to Lord Northbrook to sound the Amir in the matter. The Amir had already approached the British Government twice for a definite alliance but had found Lord Mayo, and after him Lord Northbrook, not favourably inclined towards the proposal. Lord Salisbury wanted to maintain a British resident at Kabul. But as Lord Northbrook had earlier refused to enter into any commitment with the Amir, he was not hopeful that the Afghan ruler would be inclined to accept such a proposal now. Lord Northbrook also knew that even if the Afghan ruler agreed, the freedom-loving Afghans would resent the presence of a British agent at Kabul. He, therefore, explained to the Secretary of State that all his fears were imaginary and that there was no real danger from Russia. Lord Salisbury, however, was not convinced and re-iterated his earlier proposal. He asked Lord Northbrook to send a mission to Kabul. Lord Northbrook explained to him that personally he would never favour such a forward policy but that if the Secretary of State desired him to do so, he should send him very clear instructions in the matter. He also warned him

that if the British tried to force a treaty on Afghanistan, they might have to go into a war to maintain their position in that country. This difference of opinion between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy forced the latter to write to the former to make arrangements to appoint his successor. Lord Northbrook preferred to resign his post rather than give up his principles.

Lord Northbrook sent a Commercial Mission to Yarkand. This led to the development of trade with that country. He also wanted to develop trade with Tibet and such a proposal was submitted but the famine in Bengal made him drop the proposal for the time being.

Lord Northbrook handed over the charge of his office in April, 1876 and left for England. He held a high post of trust in the Liberal Ministry of Gladstone and remained in active politics for several years. He died on the 15th of November, 1904.

Lord Northbrook was not a great imperialist or a great administrator like Lord Dalhousie or Lord Ripon. But he took a very keen interest in the welfare of Indians and was never found wanting in his judgement. According to Trotter, "he laboured quietly and zealously for the public good, fought successfully against wide spread famine, removed heavy burden from Indian trade and industry, and left a surplus budget after paying famine debt".

EARL OF LYTTON (1876—1880)

Lord Lytton, who succeeded Lord Northbrook as the British Viceroy in India, was born in 1831 at Hertford, St. Mayfair and was the son of Edward Bulwer. He received his education at Harrow and Bonn. Before he took up the viceroyalty of India in 1876, he had served in Portugal and Austria. He was a great writer of poetry and prose. Even if he had not participated in politics, he would have made his mark as a poet and a novelist. Trotter has written about him that "Lord Lytton was chiefly known as a promising poet and a rising diplomatist. Diplomacy is not the best school for an Indian Viceroy and poets have seldom ripened into successful specimen." Lord Lytton took over the charge of his office on the 12th April 1876. Earlier, he had turned down the governorship of Madras. Disraeli had so much confidence in him that he next offered him the viceroyalty of British India.

Lord Lytton had been sent to India with specific instructions to fulfil the mission of the Conservative Party by revising the earlier pacific policy of the Government as regards Afghanistan into that of a forward policy. Sher Ali had repeatedly requested Lord Lawrence, Lord Mayo and Lord Northbrook, for a specific alliance but they had avoided making a definite commitment and preferred to limit their activities to Indian borders. He, therefore, was dissatisfied and his relations with the British were estranged. Lord Salisbury, the Secretary of State, had enjoined upon Lord Lytton to send a mission to the Amir and to promise him assistance clearly if he agreed to abide by the wishes of the British Government in his foreign policy. Abdulla Jnn was to be accepted as his successor and Sher Ali's subsidy was to be increased. But now Sher Ali showed reluctance. He argued that if he signed such an agreement with the British, he could not refuse to enter into a similar agreement with the Russian Government. He suggested that he would send his special agent to the viceroy for further discussions. Lord Lytton was not satisfied with this stand of the Amir and insisted on his acceptance of the British proposals and also suggested that he himself could meet the Amir at Peshawar.

At last it was decided that the agent of the British Government at Kabul should come to India to receive a message for the Amir from the Viceroy. Instead of assuring the Amir of liberal help and assistance to protect him and his dynasty against all internal risings and external aggression, Lord Lytton sent a somewhat threatening ultimatum to the Amir. Sher Ali was already in a quandry due to the doubtful support of his followers, the risings of his relatives, rival claims to his throne and the economic bankruptcy of his government. When he received this threat from the Viceroy he was exasperated. On the top of all this, Lord Lytton came to an understanding with the Chief of Kalat and established a British post at Quetta. This action of the British made the Afghans suspicious about their intentions. The Amir therefore had to pretend that he was very eager to negotiate for the British friendship. He sent Nur Mohammad Shah as his envoy for a discussion with Sir Lewis Pelly, the agent of the Viceroy at Peshawar. However, before they could come to an understanding Nur Mohammad Shah died. Sir Lewis Pelly informed the Viceroy that the Afghans were reluctant to surrender their independence in return for any concessions offered by the British. Lord Lytton, therefore, declared the conference as

closed although the Amir wanted to continue it and had already despatched another agent to explore the possibility of some understanding with the British Government. Lord Lytton informed the Amir that the British had no commitment to protect him either from within or from without and were not bound to help him or to have any relations with him.

While Lord Lytton followed a very rash and provocative policy towards the Amir he presented quite a different picture to the Home Government. He painted the Amir as hostile and even rude and charged him with a conspiracy with the Russian Government. In the European politics England and Russia were on the brink of a war over the Turkish question. Therefore, the Russians thought of embarrassing the relations of the British with Sher Ali by sending their agent to Kabul for a possible alliance with the Amir. The situation, however, did not deteriorate further as the Russians came to an understanding with the British and the war in Europe was averted. The visit of the Russian mission to Kabul was thus reduced only to a complimentary visit. Sher Ali had proved his integrity by first refusing an entry to the Russian envoy to his court, but, with no possibility of a help from the British Government against a Russian attack, he had no alternative but to permit the Russian envoy to visit him.

At this moment Lord Lytton informed the Amir that he must accept a British Mission. The danger of Russian advance on the northern frontiers had vanished when the British and the Russian Governments entered into an understanding between them. Therefore, there was no justification for Lord Lytton's sending a mission to Kabul against the wishes of the Home Government. The mission was forced upon the reluctant Afghans who were mourning the death of Abdulla Jan, their heir apparent. When the Afghan post at Ali Masjid refused entry to the British Mission Lord Lytton wrote a strong letter against the Afghan ruler to the Home Government. The result was that there was a great hue and cry all over England for a revenge against the Afghan ruler. The Conservative Government considered Lord Lytton's stand as very weak but they had no alternative except to support him. The Amir had never refused the mission. He had simply wanted it to be postponed but the Viceroy was bent upon a war and had already collected a large army on the borders of Afghanistan. He sent him an ultimatum asking him to

accept a permanent British Resident at his court or face a war, Sher Ali was not allowed time even to reply to this ultimatum. Some writers hold that he had sent a message to the British Viceroy that he could accept a British mission on the lines of the Russian.

However, the fact remains that before this message could reach India, the British forces had already attacked Jalalabad, Kandhar and Kurram. The Amir did not consider himself strong enough to face the British Army. He fled away to the Russian Turkistan, where he died a few months later. Yaqub Khan, the eldest son of Sher Ali, opened correspondence with the British and by the Treaty of Gandmak agreed to keep a British Resident at his court. He also accepted to be governed by the dictates of the British in his foreign policy and not to correspond with any other European power. He also surrendered Sibi, Pishin and Thal-Chotiali. When the news of this British success became known in England the people were jubilant and Disraeli declared amidst great applause in the Parliament that the British Government now had a scientific frontier in India.

Lord Lawrence had correctly predicted that the British troubles in Afghanistan would begin after their victory. The Afghans never liked the interference of any foreign power in their affairs. This was clear even to the British authorities in India who had imposed a resident on the unwilling Afghans. Cavagnari, the British Resident at Kabul, was murdered by an infuriated Afghan regiment. The Afghan ruler remained a passive witness. He did try to save the British residency with the help of his forces but he was prevented from doing so by some of his followers lest it should mean humiliation at the hands of the mob of fanatics who had already insulted the Wazir and the younger brother of the Amir. On receipt of the news of the murder of the British resident, the British forces under General Roberts invaded Afghanistan. Yaqub Khan surrendered to the British General and was kept as a well-guarded prisoner during the investigations. He was forced by General Roberts to abdicate and was sent to Peshawar as a prisoner. The treatment meted out to Yaqub Khan and the declaration of General Roberts that he was in Afghanistan to avenge the murder of the British resident and to get satisfaction of the terms of Treaty of Gandmak, infuriated the Afghans all over the country still more. The situation worsened day by day. Ayub Khan, the younger brother of

Yaqub Khan was holding out at Herat and the Afghan population all over the country became hostile to the British forces. The British thought of appointing Wali Mohammad Khan as the ruler of Kabul and Sher Ali as the ruler of Kandhar but they soon realised that the Afghans would not accept the British nominees as their rulers. Abdur Rehman Khan, a nephew of Sher Ali, in the meanwhile appeared on the scene. He had all the qualities of a chief who could control the unruly Afghans. At this juncture, Conservative party was defeated in England and Lord Lytton was succeeded by Lord Ripon as the Viceroy of India under the new Liberal Government.

Lord Lytton failed in his forward policy in Afghanistan. It seems that apparently he himself did not know what he wanted to achieve in that country. In the earlier stages he simply wanted to control the foreign policy of the Amir in exchange for an assurance of assistance both against internal disturbances and against external aggression but with the lapse of time and with the change of circumstances his outlook on the Afghan problem also underwent a change. He began thinking of dividing the country into several parts with Herat and other key positions all over the country, under the British control. He attached too much importance to the Russian danger in Afghanistan which, but for a few months before the Congress of Berlin, was all but purely imaginary. For the second time the British Government had learnt that it was impolitic to follow an aggressive and forward policy in Afghanistan. But for the imposition of a British resident over the Afghans, the policy of Lord Lytton in Afghanistan adopted earlier by him would have been quite successful. But after the murder of the British resident he completely revised his stand and instead of admitting his failure to appoint a resident, he began to entertain the idea of military subjugation of that country which had failed miserably earlier.

We may turn now to a study of the domestic policy of Lord Lytton. When he left for India the Prime Minister had asked him to proclaim Queen Victoria as the Empress of India at a public function. The underlying idea was to impress upon the Indians the closeness of their connection with England and also the vassalage of the native rulers to the Queen who had by then assumed the position of the Mughal Emperor of India. On the New Year's Day of 1877 Lord Lytton held a grand Durbar at Delhi which was

attended by all the important native chiefs of India. At this Durbar the Viceroy proclaimed Queen Victoria as the Empress of India and also read a message from her to the Indians. Similar declarations were made by the Governors of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta and to mark this day fifteen thousand prisoners were set at liberty. Native rulers and nobles were also given high titles and distinctions on behalf of the Queen and it was brought home to the people that they were now a part of the grand Empire of the Queen.

While the Viceroy was thus busy in these grand celebrations, Bengal was visited by a cyclone which led to the loss of a hundred thousand lives. At the same time a great famine was raging both in West and South India. The local Governments did adopt the relief measures but these could not suffice for the starving millions and, as the Central Government, unlike in the times of Lord Northbrook, tried to economise in their relief measures, the loss of life was particularly heavy. It is a pity that the Viceroy thought of winning the hearts of the people by holding grand Durbars when he should have saved their lives by adopting proper relief measures. Sir John Strachy, the Finance Member, like his master, was equally stingy in providing relief to the famine-stricken people and without feeling any qualms of conscience on account of the heavy loss of life, declared immediately afterwards that every province would have to bear the expenses of its relief measures adopted during a famine. He showed utter lack of sympathy for the starving agriculturists by not remitting land revenues. To add to the miseries of the people, epidemics like Small-pox, Dysentery, and Cholera broke out and claimed many more lives. Famines also visited the provinces of Uttar Pradesh and Punjab and the total loss of life all over the country ranged between one and a half to two million lives. Trotter writes, "If Lord Lytton's Government spent less in proportion than Lord Northbrook's on famine relief, it was certainly after all deductions and allowances, far less successful in saving human life." To meet the expenditure on famine relief measures Lord Lytton imposed a land tax and a tax on different trades. In Bombay and Madras the local Governments refused to introduce a land tax. Instead they increased the duties on salt.

Lord Lytton was very much interested in the development of railways and the construction of irrigation works. About nine hundred miles of new railway lines were laid during his period. He appointed a special commission which recommended that all

such tenants as had been occupying a particular piece of land for a minimum period of twelve years could not be required by their landlords to pay more rent than already being paid by them except by the force of a judicial decree. This commission also recommended that all such tenants as had been occupying a particular piece of land for the last three years could not be evicted without a substantial compensation for the improvements effected by them on that land.

Lord Lytton also paid attention to the civil service. His outlook was not liberal. He was against Indians being appointed to high posts of trust and responsibility in spite of the fact that the Queen's declaration of 1858 had thrown open all services of the country to every one without any distinction of caste or creed. With the spread of English education among the Indians, many young men of parts aspired to compete for the Indian Civil Service Examination. Lord Lawrence had introduced a scheme of scholarships for the brilliant students who intended to compete for this examination. But it had been discontinued after a few years. Lord Lytton introduced a Bill by which the age of competition was lowered from nineteen to seventeen years. The age of nineteen was already an early age for the Indians to be well-conversant with English so as to compete with European candidates for this examination. Further lowering of the age completely deprived them of taking a chance. However, Lord Lytton was in favour of the appointment of Indians to the Civil Service on the basis of their rank and position in the society. He wanted that a few natives should be promoted from the subordinate services on merit while a few more should be selected from the high born and the members of the ruling families on probation of two years.

Lord Lytton was equally prejudiced against the vernacular newspapers. He did not consider them to be at par with the English newspapers and wanted to put curb on them. A Bill was passed in March 1878 which deprived the vernacular press of all its liberties. By this new order a vernacular paper was expected to deposit a surety with the District Magistrate which would be forfeited in case the paper printed any libellous matter. There was no appeal against the decision of the District Magistrate. Perhaps Lord Lytton thought that by these measures he would succeed in bringing to an end any opposition to the British rule in India. But

he was disillusioned when the people protested against this Act. Vernacular Press Act was repealed during the period of Lord Ripon in 1882 and distinction between the vernacular and the European papers was done away with.

Lord Lytton handed over the charge of his office to Lord Ripon on the 8th of June, 1880. After his return to England he held many important assignments like the Ambassadorship in Paris. However, he failed in India as a Viceroy both in his foreign policy as well as in his internal measures. He was a great scholar, a great diplomat and a great poet. Undoubtedly, he was mis-fit in India.

MARQUESS OF RIPON (1880—1884)

Lord Ripon, born on the 24th of October, 1827, was the son of Frederick Robinson, Earl of Ripon. He received his education privately and joined Parliament as a Liberal Member from Hull in 1852. He became Under Secretary of War in the Liberal Ministry of Gladstone and became the Marquess of Ripon in 1871. When the Liberals came into power in 1880, Gladstone appointed him as the Viceroy of India. He took charge from Lord Lytton on the 8th June, 1880, at Simla. Immediately after his assumption of office he was confronted with the problem of Afghanistan. Lord Ripon considered the forward policy of his predecessor as over-ambitious. However, before he could formulate his own views in the matter, a British army was defeated by Ayub Khan at Maiwand. The position was soon retrieved by General Roberts, who defeated Ayub Khan and forced him to flee to Herat. The British authorities at Kabul were not in favour of giving the throne of Afghanistan to Abdur Rehman, who was negotiating for this purpose. Rather, they wanted the restoration of Yaqub Khan, who, besides being a popular figure in Afghanistan, had not alienated himself from the British. Lord Ripon apprehended that Abdur Rehman, who was then holding out from Badakhshan would feel dissatisfied at the restoration of Yaqub Khan and supported as Abdur Rehman was by the Russians he would always prove a head-ache for the British. He, therefore, decided to hand over both Kabul and Kandhar to Abdur Rehman. He wrote to him that the British Government would neither appoint a resident at his court nor would they help him with an army in his struggle against his rivals since they did not want to interfere in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. However, if at any time the Amir needed

help, it would be given to him at the discretion of the British Government. The Government also promised to come to his rescue whenever there was an unprovoked aggression on Afghanistan by a foreign power.

Abdur Rehman took over the Government of Kabul and the British gradually withdrew their army. Abdur Rehman inherited an amount of Rupees nine and a half lakhs in the treasury at Kabul and the British gave him a further sum of Rupees fifteen lakhs so that he could establish himself properly at Kabul.

As soon as Ayub Khan, who was then at Herat, heard of the accession of Abdur Rehman at Kabul, he advanced upon Kandhar. He defeated an army sent by Abdur Rehman under Ghulam Haidar on the 27th of July at Chirshk and captured Kandhar. Lord Ripon refused to interfere. However, soon there after Abdur Rehman defeated Ayub Khan on the 22nd of September, 1880 and captured Herat.

Abdur Rehman had now reduced all his rivals. The British had already withdrawn from his territories and Lord Ripon was contented with the strengthening of the British bases at Sibi and Pishin. The British now held strong bases around Kabul and Kandhar and could march upon Afghanistan without any difficulty whenever an occasion arose. The forward policy, followed earlier by Lord Lytton had proved very costly. The British not only had to keep an occupation army in Afghanistan permanently but also had to face the hostile demonstrations of the Afghans. There was no immediate danger of a Russian attack. It was, therefore, a very sound policy to keep a strong hold on the important strategic bases and to have a vigilant eye on the day to day developments in Afghanistan. It was approved by the Home Government.

At one time when the Russians advanced their forces and captured Mew, it appeared as if Lord Ripon's policy in Afghanistan would fail. Lord Ripon, however, succeeded in the appointment of a boundary Commission for demarcating boundary between Russia and Afghan territories. Before the Commission could start its work, Lord Ripon laid down his office and returned to England.

Lord Lytton had appointed a commission in 1879 to report on the ways and means of reducing the strength of the army. During the campaigns of 1880 in Afghanistan, several defects in the organisation of the army came to notice. There was no coordination

between different units. The Bombay and Madras armies behaved as if they had no link with the Bengal army. The armies of the three presidencies had no uniform system of promotions and appointments. As a result several officers had got rapid promotions without any outstanding merit. The commission realised this drawback and in order to end this rivalry amongst the officers recommended that the posts of the commander-in-chief of the presidencies of Madras and Bombay be abolished and the armies of all the three provinces i.e., Bombay, Madras and Bengal be placed under the charge of the commander-in-chief of the British armies in India. The commission also recommended that all such British regiments, as were under the direct control of the Home Government, should be paid by the Home Government. The Home Government had always tried to foist the maintenance of this army on the Indian Government which could ill-afford to keep it. Lord Ripon objected to this and in one of his despatches to the Home Government in July 1882 reiterated his earlier demand, stating that India could afford to have these British armies only if the Home Government were prepared to meet the cost of their maintenance. He added that he was ready to pay for an army which he considered essential for the maintenance of law and order in the country. The Home Government rejected the proposal regarding the abolition of the posts of commander-in-chief of the presidencies of Bombay and Madras at this time but thirteen years later these were abolished. The British Government, however, agreed to the reduction of the British forces in India to some extent.

A military expedition had been sent from India to Egypt. Lord Ripon asked the Home Government to bear the cost of the expedition, but Gladstone did not agree and informed Lord Ripon that the expedition in question was equally in the interest of India, which was carrying on a roaring trade through the Suez Canal. Lord Ripon, however, reiterated his stand on the ground that he did not feel himself justified in charging from the people of India more than what was required for the maintenance of peace in the country. The Home Government had to agree to meet a part of the expenditure. It is thus obvious that Lord Ripon always looked at a problem from an indigenous angle, fought for the interests of India and behaved like a true Indian in his correspondence with the Home Government.

Lord Ripon next turned his attention to the economic reforms. Even though the Home Government had full faith in him they

began to interfere more and more in Indian affairs with the improvement in the system of communication between India and England. Lord Ripon resented this and even remarked once that had he known that in India he would have to face such a situation, then he would have thought twice before embarking for India. His finance member, Mr. Baring, had a perfect understanding of various economic problems facing the country. In his budget, he recommended that the customs duty should be abolished and that indirect taxes should be replaced by direct taxes. He further recommended that the salt duty should be reduced and instead the licence tax and income-tax should be imposed on all those persons whose annual income was Rupees two thousand and above. Lord Ripon did not agree to all these recommendations. He had full confidence in Mr. Baring but he had also to take into account other political considerations. He did not agree to the imposition of income-tax on such landlords as had been granted vast tracts of land under the permanent settlement of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa. He was in favour of reduction of the Government expenses and felt that import duty on all items except cotton could be abolished. This led to a difference of opinion between Lord Ripon and Baring. However, Lord Northbrook, who was acquainted with the situation, intervened and by a telegraphic message to Baring, his cousin, persuaded him to agree to a compromise. The income-tax was dropped and the licence tax was allowed to stay on as before. After some time the income-tax was imposed but the landlords were exempted from it. The customs duty had to be imposed later and the salt tax too was raised to meet the deficit.

Lord Ripon had to face a stiff opposition from the Home Government on the question of construction of more railways. Lord Ripon considered railways as very essential for reducing the occurrence of famines. With a good system of communications the foodgrains could be transported quickly wherever there was a shortage. He wanted that private entrepreneurs should be encouraged to invest money in the construction of railways and the amount provided for the famines should be used as a guarantee of interest for the money invested by the people. On the other hand, the Home Government had decided that the construction of the railways should be financed from the famine insurance fund. This meant delay of several decades in the construction of railways as the entire programme had been placed over a period of thirty years. The

Home Government desired that only as much construction work should be taken up in the beginning as was commercially remunerative. In one of his despatches to the Home Government Lord Ripon wrote that the Government had no right to rule over a people whom it could not save from starvation. The authorities in England were, however, not so enthusiastic or sympathetic. The scheme was rejected, but Lord Ripon followed up the question so persistently that the Home Government had to agree to spend a larger amount on the construction of railways.

Lord Ripon tackled the land problem next. He considered that the prosperity of the State lay in the well-being of the peasants, the betterment of whose lot was therefore one of his primary concerns. His reforms were based on the recommendations of the Famine Commission. He established a new department, known as the Revenue and Agriculture Department, to look after the problems of land. Under his supervision an up-to-date land survey was completed and a proper assessment of the land revenue was made. Lord Cornwallis had given many concessions to the Zamindars under the permanent settlement and had ignored the interests of the peasants and cultivators. Lord Canning had tried to ameliorate their difficulties by the Bengal Rent Bill in 1859. Under this Act the cultivators could claim to pay a fair rent and a fixity of tenure. When Lord Cornwallis handed over the proprietary rights in land to the Zamindars, a clause had been inserted in the mutual agreement that the Government could check up the rights of the landlords even at a later date and repudiate them if it was convinced that some other party had a better claim over those lands. The new law gave the peasants and cultivators the security which they had enjoyed before the British took over. The landlords too were given the rights to a share in the additional production of the land. The Commission went through the grievances and claims of the peasants and declared that all such ryots as had been in occupation of a piece of land for three years should henceforth enjoy the occupancy rights. This was to safeguard the peasants against the Zamindars who might try to uproot such of them as had been in occupation of a piece of land for the last three years and by transferring them to other pieces of land deny them the occupancy rights. Lord Ripon, who attached the rights to the land instead of the man, accepted this recommendation of the Commission. There was a great hue and cry against this policy but Lord Ripon remained firm. The Home Government

did not agree with these changes and Lord Ripon was asked to introduce these recommendations in the form of a Bill. The landed classes gave a very tough opposition and the viceroy became very unpopular. However, he succeeded in winning over the landed classes to his point of view after conceding some of their points. He also made a settlement of the tenancy rights in Oudh. These philanthropic activities of Lord Ripon were appreciated in England. Marquess of Hertington, the Secretary of State, who had opposed several measures of Lord Ripon and delayed many others wrote to Lord Ripon at the time of quitting the office of the Secretary of State, "I have long felt that many of the subjects on which you have worked so hard and in which you have taken so much interest, have been neglected and postponed in a way which was not fair to you, your colleagues or India.....I must thank you very heartily for the temper in which you have received instructions which you have not altogether approved and the patience with which you have endured our delays." (taken from the Biography of Lord Ripon by Lucien Wolf—Volume II).

The turmoil of 1857 and subsequent progress made by India during the third quarter of nineteenth century made it obligatory for the British Government to give due weight to the public opinion in this country. The people were no longer backward. Opening of railways and telegraphic services and the spread of education had developed a spirit of unity and the faculty of analysis. Lord Ripon considered it necessary to give some opportunities to Indians in the political field.

He thus thought of introducing in India what came to be known as Local Self Government. He even thought of introducing a provincial council system, through which the people could be associated with the administration of the provinces but he soon realised that that would be a premature step. The Municipal Self-Government Department was set up under Sir Baring with the approval of the Home Government. A system of elections was also introduced gradually in all the provinces of India. In the initial stages it was thought expedient that the elections should be according to the caste and occupation and the right to vote should not be given to every one. Rather it should be restricted only to the intelligentsia who had the capacity to understand the implications of self-government. Lord Ripon's idea was that by this system a "Gradual

training of the best, most intelligent and most influential men in a community would be imparted and in the later stages the people would be transferred their administration of the various localities." In the beginning, it was proposed that the Executive Officers in the districts should guide the representatives of the people in the administration. The Home Government did not agree in regard to the control of the local bodies. They wanted that the district officers should be at the head of the local boards. However, when it was explained to them that this would lead to a lack of interest by the intelligent and influential persons, they gave away and gradually the district officers withdrew, leaving the whole of the initiative with the elected representatives of the people. Before Lord Ripon left for England the system of Local-self Government had been introduced in most of the provinces. It is for these reasons that he has been called the father of the Local Self Government in India.

Lord Lytton had curtailed the freedom of the vernacular newspapers. Under the Press Law enacted during his viceroyalty they could be called upon to furnish a cash security to the local magistrates and had to undertake not to publish any seditious material. This had led to a lot of criticism by the liberal party in England who thought that the curtailment of the privileges of press was a blot on the name of the British Government. These restrictions were unjustified particularly because these applied only to the vernacular press. Moreover, there was no appeal against the action of a local magistrate. The only saving grace was that the Act had not been enforced in most of the provinces for the last four years. Immediately after the arrival of Lord Ripon in India, the liberals, who had now come into power in England, asked him to repeal it. Lord Ripon did not like this act but he hesitated to repeal it immediately as it had been passed by the Legislative Council in India. The Secretary of State was, however, so eager to repeal it that he was prepared even to overrule the Legislative Council if necessary. Lord Ripon, however, adopted a more realistic approach. Before introducing bill for the Press Act he had the matter discussed in his Council threadbare and convinced his colleagues of his stand. The result was that when the bill for the repeal of the vernacular press act was introduced there was no opposition to it. Lord Ripon's measure, however, had a clause that a

district magistrate could punish the newspapers for publishing seditious matter.

Although under the Charles Wood despatch of 1854 a regular system of educational programme for the Indians had been planned, no appreciable progress had so far been made in that direction. The primary education was particularly ignored. Lord Ripon was not in favour of a Government control over education in the initial stages. Therefore, he encouraged private bodies to spread the education among the masses. A commission was appointed in 1881 to examine the whole problem and to report on the various drawbacks. The Report of the Commission was ready in 1883 and was circulated to all the provinces for comments. However, before any action could be taken on the recommendations of Commission, Lord Ripon laid down his office and returned to England.

Lord Ripon next turned his attention to the Indian Civil Service regulations. At that time there were two categories of Indians in the Indian Civil Service. First, those who had been promoted from the subordinate services and second those who had come through the Indian Civil Service examination. Lord Lytton wanted to discourage Indians from entering the Indian Civil Service direct. By a law passed in 1876 he reduced the age for appearing in the Indian Civil Service Examination from 19 to 17, thus thinning their chances further. In fact he wanted to debar them completely. He had suggested that only Indians of good social standing and belonging to aristocratic families should be considered for appointment to this service. On the contrary, Lord Ripon wanted Indians to be given greater chances. He proposed the holding of simultaneous examination for this service in England and in India. He opined that the Indians could not afford to go to England to appear in this examination. He even suggested the introduction of a paper in an oriental language for this examination. He also recommended raising of the age limit but his council opposed him on this issue. Ultimately it was decided that one-fifth of the posts in these services should be filled up by promotion of the Indians from lower services and that such Indians as were brilliant, should be encouraged by grant of scholarships to compete for this examination.

Within a short period of five years, Lord Ripon tried to introduce many reforms which made even the Home Government a little apprehensive of their results. They thought that he was over-enthusiastic and his activities might invite opposition of the European

community in India. The apprehension proved true. The Europeans in India raised a great hue and cry against Lord Ripon when the latter introduced a bill, whereby the Europeans were to be brought nt par with the natives all over the country in the matter of administration of justice. The Bill is known as the Ilbert Bill. According to this Bill, a native magistrate could try a European. Upto this time this privilege was enjoyed only by the presidency magistrates and judges. When the Government tried to extend this privilege to district magistrates and session judges all over the country, the Europeans represented that it should only be given to the Europeans. This demand was unfair to the Indians who had competed with their British counterparts for the Indian Civil Service Examination and were in no way inferior to the European magistrates. Lord Ripon thought that these Indians could be given the additional powers which would help the Government to tide over many of its administrative difficulties especially when the Europeans were not available in large numbers. The comments of all the provincial Governments were invited on this proposal. All of them with the exception of Coorg, expressed themselves in favour of the proposed arrangement. It was, therefore, decided that the powers to try the Europeans should be given to all the native magistrates and session judges. These recommendations were approved by the Home Government. However, when these were introduced in the Legislative Council, there was a great opposition from the Anglo-Indians and the Europeans all over the country. There was criticism of the Government in the press and several petitions were sent to the Home Government against this decision. Lord Ripon had a very trying time. In one of his despatches to the Home Government he said that he would not have introduced this Bill had he known that it would lead to such an opposition. This led to the estrangement of relations between the Europeans and the Indians. Till this agitation the Indians had never been given an impression that they were considered inferior. In the Queen's declaration of 1858 it had been stated that "It is our will that, so far as may be, our subjects of whatever race or creed will be freely and impartially admitted to offices in our service, the duties of which they may be qualified by their education, ability and integrity duly to discharge." Strong opposition to the implementation of this principle in the above measure created misapprehension in the minds of the Indians who began to doubt the very integrity of the British Government. Lord

Ripon consulted the judges of the High Court. They found nothing unjustified in the Bill but as there was a great agitation against it, some of them suggested making some amendments. The Home Government advised the viceroy to withdraw the Bill. Lord Ripon struck upon a *via media* and introduced the bill after making some amendments in it to satisfy the European community. Under these amendments the Europeans were given the right to claim a European jury against the decision of a district magistrate or a session judge. This pacified the European community but the purpose of the Bill was defeated. A distinction between a European and an Indian did remain. By the second amendment it was declared that all the district magistrates and the session judges, whether European or Indian, were to enjoy the same status and there was to be no distinction between them. The powers of the district magistrates were further increased. Now they could imprison a man for six months or impose a fine of Rs. 1,000/-.

Lord Ripon left India in December, 1884 and was succeeded by Lord Dufferin. He was the most popular viceroy in India. He never considered himself separate from the Indians and he devoted himself to the welfare of the people. By the introduction of several reforms, he greatly endeared himself to the public. Raja Sahib Dayal, in one of his letters to Sir Aitchison, thus complimented him, "The crisis will not come in my day, for I am now a very old man, but come it will ; and when it does come, send for Lord Ripon. He will do more for you than regiments of soldiers, and our women will sell their jewels and lay them at his feet." The popularity of Lord Ripon in India was also acknowledged by Lord Dufferin, his successor, who, in one of his letters to Lord Ripon, wrote, "In all my private letters, whether addressed to your political opponents or to your friends, I have invariably borne the most earnest and warm testimony to the ability, the industry, the conscientiousness, and the noble and lofty spirit which characterised your control of affairs, as was evinced by every paper of yours that came under my eye. The only criticism that has ever occurred to me in reference to your proceedings has been that in rendering yourself so popular with the natives you have made the position a little difficult for your successor". (Quoted from Lucien Wolf Volume II). Viscount Mersey, a modern writer, has called him "A trained statesman with a good tradition behind him, a loyal colleague, an experienced administrator and a convinced and religious radical". He died in 1909 at the age of 82 years.

MARQUESS OF DUFFERIN (1884—1888)

Lord Dufferin was born on the 21st of June, 1826 at Florence and was educated at Eton and Christ Church. He became a Member of the House of Lords in 1849. He was included in the Liberal Ministry of Lord Palmerston as the Under Secretary of State for the Indian affairs. Later on, he was appointed as the Paymaster General of the forces. In 1872 he was appointed as Governor General of Canada. He served as the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg and Constantinople. After Lord Ripon he became the Viceroy of India. He landed in Bombay on the 8th of December, 1884 and assumed the charge of his office on the 13th December at Calcutta.

At that time a strong tussle was going on between the two groups of divergent opinions. Lord Ripon, his predecessor, had become very popular among Indians by his reforms. On the other hand, he had become very unpopular with the European community in India due to the controversy on the Ilbert Bill and his other reforms, which were, according to the Europeans, far ahead of the time. Therefore, Lord Dufferin, immediately after his assumption of charge, found his position very difficult. But he had seen a lot of diplomatic service. He understood that it was in his interest as well as that of his party to continue the policy of his predecessor.

Lord Dufferin took up the land revenue problem of Bengal. Lord Canning was the first Governor General to realise the sad plight of the tenants in Bengal due to the Permanent settlement of Lord Cornwallis. He was able to secure some concessions for the tenants but those were not enough. Lord Lawrence also tried to alleviate the sufferings of the tenants. Lord Dufferin was himself a Zamindar and had taken a very keen interest in the land problem of Ireland. The problem in India was similar to it with a slight difference. In Ireland a landlord was both the owner of the land and also the rent collector. In India these duties were shared between the Government and the landlord. Lord Dufferin did not want to ignore completely the interests of the landlords, but, at the same time, he wanted to secure a fixed tenure and a fixed rent for the tenants-at-will who were completely at the mercy of the landlords and had been suffering pitifully at their hands. Besides paying an enhanced rent every now and then they had occasionally been evicted by the landlords without any reason. Lord Dufferin explain-

ed to the landlords that the tenants-at-will must be given security of tenure and that in case of a dispute between the landlords and the tenants, the decision should be equitable. The landlords raised a great hue and cry against this interference of the Government, which, they argued, was against the terms of the Permanent Settlement. Lord Dufferin explained that he was doing nothing against the earlier Settlement, rather, he was trying to complete the work of that Settlement. Lord Dufferin also took up the cause of the tenants in Oudh and gave them greater security against unscrupulous eviction by their landlords. It was decided that in case of a dispute between the landlord and a tenant, the landlord had the right to eject the tenant but he would pay compensation for the improvement on the land made by the tenant. The land revenue also could not be enhanced within a period of seven years after it had been fixed with the mutual consent of the landlord and the tenant. Lord Dufferin also took up the land problem in the Punjab. The Punjab Land Tenancy Bill was passed and the disputes between the tax collectors and the cultivators were settled amicably. According to his biographer, Lord Dufferin should be "credited with the accomplishment of very material improvements of the land laws to the benefit of the proprietary and cultivating classes in Bengal, in the Oudh, and in the Punjab."

Another important event of the period of Lord Dufferin was the foundation, in 1885 of the Indian National Congress by Mr. A.O. Hume. Lord Dufferin personally was in favour of giving Indians a greater share in the administration of the country. He himself assisted the founder of the Indian National Congress and wanted that the organisation should be more a political body than a social organisation. He wanted it to work on the lines of the House of Commons in England. The Congress represented the views of a section of the educated people of India. The development of education, press, and communication system followed by a long spell of peace and prosperity, created a sense of liberty and equality among the educated Indians. The Congress, when set up, was a body meant only to report the popular reaction to the Government. The leaders of this movement, unlike those of the rising of 1857, were in favour of gaining concessions from the British Government in stages and securing a constitutional government for their country in the long run. The Indian National Congress requested the British Government in one of its resolutions to hold simultaneous examina-

tions for the civil services in England and India and to give to the Indians a larger share, in the Legislative Council of the Viceroy. They also requested the Government to introduce an election system for the appointment of non-official members to the Legislative Council and to give up the policy of nominating members to it as the persons thus nominated or appointed on the recommendation of the Provincial Governments did not represent the general public. Lord Dufferin personally felt that the Congress was justified in its demands as the British Government had already promised to the natives higher education, liberty of press and right of equality before the law and in the services by the proclamation of 1858. In one of his minutes, dated the 26th of April, 1886, he recorded, "My own inclination would be to examine carefully and seriously the demands which are the outcome of these various movements ; to give quickly and with a good grace whatever it may be possible or desirable to accord ; to announce that the concessions must be accepted as a final settlement of the Indian system for the next ten or fifteen years; and to forbid mass meetings and incendiary speechifying.....the objects even of the more advanced party are neither very dangerous nor very extravagant." He remarked at another place, "I think there should be enough statesmanship amongst us to contrive the means of permitting them to do so without unduly compromising our imperial supremacy." He recommended the enlargement of the Legislative Council and the inclusion of some elected representatives of the educated people of India. This policy would have made the government very popular among the people. It would have not only enlisted the cooperation of the educated classes but would also have brought into the civil service really capable persons willing to shoulder the responsibility.

While Lord Dufferin was personally in favour of giving every encouragement to the Congress leaders, they had some internal differences among themselves and became divided into two groups. The members who were very moderate in their demands belonged to the progressive group. The others were conservatives, who, besides opposing every measure of social advancement in the country, were not in favour of showing any special consideration to the Muslims who were a respectable minority in the country. Generally speaking the Congress was an organisation of the educated elite. General public as yet did not know the importance of nationalism and was thus not very enthusiastic about the development and the progress

of the organisation. With the passage of time the Congress leaders drifted away from their policy of having a limited number of demands within the existing constitution. Besides demanding an elective element in the Legislative Council and holding of simultaneous examinations, they desired that the Arms Act should be repealed and the Indian Council in England be abolished. They also wanted the reduction of the British army in India and the recruitment of the Indians as volunteers during the period of emergency. The British Government were not in favour of giving so many concessions to the Indians or reducing the British content of the army to such an extent as to jeopardize the safety of their government. In their zeal, the Congress leaders began to make direct attacks on the officials, including even the Viceroy.

The agitation for the enlargement of the Legislative Council by including the representatives of the people had been going on since the passing of the Act in 1861. The development of education had made the people conscious of their privileges. On the basis of the proclamation of 1858 they demanded from the Government their due share in the administration of the country. Lord Ripon too had felt that the existing Legislative Council was not very well set up as the nominated members were not fully acquainted with the needs of the people. They were the representatives of the aristocratic classes or had been recruited from among the rulers of India. They were not much interested in the business of the Council. Lord Dufferin also thought along similar lines, and, when his wife, after attending a meeting of the Legislative Council, gave a very poor impression of it, he became determined to bring about the reform of the Council. He recommended to the Home Government that the Council should be given some more powers and its functions should be expanded. It should be allowed to discuss the budget and to make concrete suggestions to the Viceroy for the administration of the country. Personally, Lord Dufferin was not in favour of taking the representatives of only the common people because as yet they did not realise their responsibilities and practically had no voice in the society. Lord Dufferin wanted to appoint representatives of various interests to the Council. He suggested that besides the nobility and the aristocratic and landed classes representatives should also be chosen from the business community, the agriculturists and the minority communities. Lord Dufferin also recommended that the provinces should be given a better control over their

finances. When the Muslims represented against the election system and wished that nominations should be given a preference he sympathised with them but told them that they should try to bring themselves at par with the Hindus. Although Lord Dufferin could not gain anything impressive in this direction during his period, still his recommendations bore fruit in the long run. The concessions given to the Indians in the Act of 1892 had been, to a certain extent, initiated by him.

Lord Ripon had recommended the abolition of the separate posts of the commanders-in-chief of the two Presidencies and the amalgamation of the cadres of Bengal, Madras and Bombay into one under the commander-in-chief of the Bengal forces who would in future be the commander-in-chief of all the forces in India. The commanders-in-chief of Bombay and Madras were to be known as the Lieutenant-Generals. He had also recommended that there should be four Lieutenant Generals for the four provinces of Bengal, Bombay, Madras and N.W.P. all of whom should be under the Commander-In-Chief. This reform, according to Lord Ripon, was to lead both to efficiency and economy. The Home Government had not agreed as they were not convinced about the advisability of this measure.

Lord Dufferin studied the question and was fully convinced that Lord Ripon was justified in his recommendations. With the maintenance of a separate cadre of the army of Madras and Bombay there could not be unity among the British forces in India. This not only hampered the manoeuvres of the British forces at the front but the divided command also sometimes resulted in indiscipline and the rivalry among different cadres. He sent a proposal for the amalgamation of the armies of the three Presidencies under the Commander-In-Chief of Bengal. He recommended it on the plea that there was an imminent danger of a Russian attack and a divided command would be a great disadvantage. The Secretary of State, however, informed him that although he completely agreed with his proposals he did not consider it an opportune time for this kind of reform. Lord Dufferin pressed for the acceptance of his proposal in another despatch in which he informed the Home Government that the commanders of the two Presidencies could be allowed to have direct correspondence with the commander-in-chief. Several military departments of the three Presidencies had already been amalgamated and only the military authorities of the two

Presidencies existed separately. Although no particular economy or saving was expected out of the reform but it was considered very desirable by him in the interest of efficiency in the army. In February, 1891 British Parliament passed a resolution to give effect to this change. The amalgamation of the three Presidency forces was carried out as it had been recommended by Lord Dufferin. The Government of Madras and Bombay protested against this change but could not do anything to stop the process. The actual amalgamation took place only during the period of the successor of Lord Dufferin but the full credit for this useful reform goes to him.

Lord Dufferin proposed that native young men belonging to aristocratic families may be given commissions in the army. There was great opposition to this proposal which was considered as revolutionary and dangerous. Besides there were other complications involved in this proposal as the European non-commissioned officers felt it below their dignity to salute their native superior officers. The proposal therefore had to be dropped. Lord Curzon next formulated a concrete plan for the training of the children of the chiefs for the military service. Till the first World War the British Government adopted a very indifferent attitude towards the appointment of the natives to the commissioned ranks. It was only after the War that they changed their attitude.

The slender resources of the Indian Exchequer could not afford to maintain a large standing army. Lord Dufferin, therefore, recommended that either there should be separate regiments of the reservists or there should be a general pool of such people who could be called up during an emergency and divided into various regiments. Under this scheme the reservists were to be called for training once in a year or two. They would get either a gratuity of Rs. 20/- for every completed month of training plus their salary during the training period or only [a gratuity of Rs. 24/- for every completed month of training. The scheme was inaugurated in the provinces of Bengal and Punjab in 1886 but it was not very popular or successful and the Government had to replace it by the scheme of Territorial Army.

Lord Dufferin preferred the recruitment of the Sikhs, the Gurkhas and the Dogras to the Indian Army as they were more loyal and energetic than the soldiers from U.P. and Bengal. The number of old Bengal regiments therefore gradually dwindled

down. They were replaced by the regiments of the Sikhs, the Gurkhas and the Pathans. There was a great agitation among the educated classes of India for the reduction of the army. This was resisted by Lord Dufferin as, according to him, the country confronted dangers on its borders. He promised that as soon as the strength of the reservists was brought upto a certain level the army will be reduced proportionately. Lord Dufferin also took up the question of bearing the cost of the military expedition sent from India to Egypt at the request of the Home Government. He rightly held that India had no interest in Egypt and the army was sent there only to serve the interests of the Home Government. It was, therefore, but proper that the Home Government should pay the salaries of the soldiers for the period of their service in Egypt. The Home Government, however, did not agree to this proposal.

The Russians had been gradually advancing towards the northern borders of Afghanistan. Before his departure from India Lord Ripon had impressed upon the Home Government the desirability of demarcation of the borders between Afghanistan and Russia by a joint commission, appointed by the two powers. The Commission was appointed and had started its work. There was some area on the northern borders of Afghanistan over which the political jurisdiction was undefined. This was the land of the Turkmans at whose cost both the Russians and the Afghans were aggrandizing themselves. A stage was reached when both the powers came face to face in this region, and, as was to be expected, a dispute arose between them. The disputed part was Panjdeh. The Afghans were in actual occupation of this place. The Russians had also fairly advanced into this territory and held places like Zulfiqar Pass, Ak Robat and Kizil Tapa which were not very far from the Afghan posts. As a result, tension prevailed between the two armies. The Afghans pushed ahead upto River Kushk which was resented by the Russians. They sent an ultimatum to the Afghans to evacuate the area but it was turned down by the Afghans. There was a skirmish in which the Afghans were beaten. Panjdeh also slipped out of their hands. The Russians at once declared that it formed a part of their territory. This attitude of the Russian Government led to a strong resentment both in England and India. Here it will be recalled that the British Government in India had already promised protection to the Afghans in case of an unprovoked aggression over their territories.

It was at this critical juncture that Lord Dufferin took over as Viceroy. The key post of Herat was vulnerable. Realising the gravity of the situation, Lord Dufferin asked the Amir of Afghanistan to allow a British force to march through Afghanistan to Herat for its defence. The Amir informed the Viceroy that the Afghans would never tolerate the passage of a British army through Kandhar for occupying Herat. He, however, agreed that if the situation became critical and the Russians captured Herat he would allow the British to occupy Kundhar for the defence of their Indian territories. Lord Dufferin met Abdur Rehman, the Amir of Kabul, in a meeting at Rawalpindi. While the conference was going on, the Russians captured Panjdeh. The Amir showed his indifference in the matter treating the incident as merely an intolerable irregularity which could happen at any undefined frontier. By this time Gladstone had moved the British Parliament for a grant to mobilise the British forces if it was found necessary. A sum of one crore and ten lakhs sterling was voted by the Parliament. On being informed of the indifference of Abdur Rehman over the question Gladstone agreed to an arbitration with the Russians over the disputed territories. The peace was made but Panjdeh remained with the Russians. The British considered it as a dishonourable peace. But the Amir wanted to avoid going into a war with the Russians over Panjdeh. Even the fighting which took place between the Russians and the Afghans was considered by him as useless and instigated by the British member of the Boundary Commission, who wished to see estranged relations between the Afghans and the Russians. He did not want his country to become a battle-field between Russia and England over a question which involved a barren and unproductive territory. By avoiding war he avoided undue extension of the influence of the British and their interference in his internal affairs. In the face of this the British could do nothing. Lord Dufferin promised him the continuance of the assistance already being given to him. By July, 1887, the boundary between the Afghan and the Russian territories had been demarcated and the danger of hostilities between the two powers diminished.

Like his predecessor, Lord Dufferin wanted to cultivate friendship with the Amir of Afghanistan by pursuing a policy of non-interference in his internal affairs and ensuring a frank understanding between the Home Government and the Government of Russia in regard to Afghanistan. Sir Alfred Lyall, the biographer of Lord Dufferin,

writes, "It was Lord Dufferin's belief that considerations of expediency and good faith, combined with the chances of European politics, which might preoccupy the Russians elsewhere, would operate to deter them from moving forward under such conditions, or would at least materially delay it". Lord Dufferin greatly strengthened Indian borders and before his departure for England wrote that Russia would never think of lending an invasion over India till it produced a great general like Alexander or Napoleon. Even then Russian aggressor would come to grief as the British Government in India had strengthened all the strategic places and thus completely closed the borders to a foreigner.

During the period of Lord Almerston in 1826, the Burmese had entered the British territories in pursuit of some of their refugees and forced the British Government to declare a war upon them. They were defeated and forced to part with Arakan, Tennasserim, to evacuate the territories of Assam and Cachar and to acknowledge the independence of Manipur. Even after this disaster the Burmese Government remained indifferent towards the British, and created all sorts of difficulties for the British merchants who went to Burma for the purpose of trading. The representations of the British traders to the British Government in India forced the latter to declare another war over the Burmese ruler in 1854 and to occupy southern Burma. The Burmese ruler, however, continued creating difficulties for the British merchants and the British Government in India was forced to withdraw their resident from the Burmese court in 1879 after lodging a protest. This had no effect on the Burmese ruler. He imposed further restrictions on the British traders and concluded a commercial treaty with the French in February, 1885. At this juncture a war with the Russians over the Panjdeh incident was imminent. Therefore, the British Government were not inclined to start another war in the east with Burma. At the same time, they also could not remain indifferent to the belligerent attitude of the Burmese and their flirtations with the French, as it would have jeopardized the Indian trade with Burma. Once the French had established themselves at the Burmese court, they would have created numerous difficulties for the British. The inaction of the British had already emboldened the Burmese ruler who imposed a very heavy fine on a British trading company. The Indian Government asked the Government of Burma to refer the case to them but the latter refused to agree. The Indian Government were forced to send an

ultimatum to the Burmese ruler asking him to break all connections with the French and to keep a British resident at his court. The Burmese ruler took no notice of it. A British army, therefore, advanced upon northern Burma. The Burmese did not offer any resistance and surrendered to the British armies.

Burma lay prostrate before Lurd Dufferin who had three alternatives before him. He could dethrone the ruler and set up one of his relatives as the new ruler of Burma on the condition that the latter would maintain a British resident at his court and surrender his foreign policy to the control of the British Government. Secondly, the ruler of Burma could be asked to accept the Subsidiary system and to carry on his Government like other princes in India who had acknowledged the British supremacy. The third alternative was to annex Burma to the British Empire and to pension off the ruler. General Roberts, who had been despatched to Burma to report on the situation there, recommended the annexation of the country as no prince of the royal blood was available. The Government accordingly annexed Burma to the British Empire. A commissioner was appointed to look after the administration of the whole of northern and southern Burma. Through a declaration the Burmese were informed that the administration of their country had been transferred to the British sovereign. They were assured that the new Government would respect their ancient rights, privileges, customs and religious institutions. In the beginning the new Government had to face many difficulties. The British were not well-acquainted with the people of northern Burma. By the annexation of that country and disbanding of the Burmese army several thousand people became unemployed and turned into robbers, thieves and highwaymen. There was no police system worth the name and the commissioner had to experience a lot of difficulty in keeping the unruly elements under control. When reports of such lawlessness reached England, it led to a severe criticism of Lord Dufferin. However, after a period of two years, the British Government were able to restore peace in that region.

The Chinese sovereign claimed suzerainty over Burma and disputed the British annexation of that territory. At this very time the British Government in India had secured permission from the Chinese Government for the despatch of a commercial mission to Tibet, which was also a tributary State of China. The Tibetans

obstructed the progress of the mission to Lhasa. As the Chinese failed to check this hostile attitude of the Tibetans, Lord Dufferin thought it expedient to drop the idea of sending a mission especially when the Tibetans did not like the British to have any trading agency in their country. The Government of China felt relieved when informed of it and as a reciprocal measure agreed to the British annexation of Burma by the convention of 1886. The British withdrawal of their mission was construed by the Tibetans as their weakness. They, therefore, advanced and occupied Lingtu. The British Government objected to it as Sikkim was a tributary state under them. The Tibetans were given an ultimatum to vacate those regions and avoid the violation of the sovereignty of Sikkim. But, without even opening the letters of the British Government, the Tibetan Government arrogantly returned them to the British. The latter were thus forced to send an army and get the territories of Lingtu evacuated from the Tibetans and restore these to Sikkim.

Like his predecessor, Lord Dufferin had great sympathy for the people of India. He wanted to give the Indians a greater share in the administration of the country. However, like Lord Ripon, he also had to keep in view the possible opposition of the European community in this country.

The period of Lord Dufferin was full of events both external and internal. During his period the final boundary line was drawn, demarcating the frontiers of Afghanistan and Russia. A railway line was constructed in Baluchistan. A rising was put down in Sikkim and Abdur Rehman of Afghanistan was befriended by diplomacy. Lord Dufferin also initiated many reforms, which, although not approved by the Home Government, were passed after he had left. He introduced two Land Bills for the Punjab and brought about some reforms in the land systems of Bengal and Oudh. A University was established at Allahabad. The regions of Oudh and the N.W.P. were amalgamated and a separate Legislative Council for them was established. He maintained very close and personal relations with the rulers of various Indian States. He understood the sentiments of the people and the importance of the Congress. He thought that the demand of the people could not be suppressed for a long time and that they should be given some concessions. Lord Curzon, however, felt that Lord Dufferin had gone too far in his policy of appeasement of the Indians. Hamilton, who became the Secretary of State

for India a decade later, complained of this policy of appeasement of Lord Dufferin and remarked that he had purchased popularity and left unpleasant legacies to his successor.

In October, 1887 Lord Dufferin wanted to resign on personal grounds. Lord Salisbury informed him in February, 1888 that he was being considered for the post of an Ambassador at Rome. He readily agreed to the proposal and resigned. He was given a farewell on the 23rd of March, 1888 at Calcutta.

MARQUESS OF LANSDOWNE (1888—1894)

Lord Lansdowne, who succeeded Lord Dufferin as the British Viceroy in India, was born on the 14th of January, 1845. He got his education at Woodcote, Eton and Balliol. His parents took a very keen interest in the progress of his education. He developed the habit of writing a letter to his mother once a week and he continued to do so for about forty years till his mother died in 1895. These letters according to his biographer, "Reveal not only capacity and a strong sense of duty, but modesty, unselfishness, humour, and almost passionate attachment to home and family life." According to his tutor Lord Lansdowne was studious but unimaginative in his early years. Although he was quite intelligent, his shyness prevented him from doing justice to his capabilities. His father died in 1865 when he was still at Oxford and only twenty-one. He inherited a vast fortune and the high title of his family. He entered Parliament in 1865 and became an Under Secretary for India in the Gladstone Ministry. However, he soon resigned due to his differences with the Prime Minister on the Irish question. Lord Beaconsfield, the leader of the opposition, complimented him for his sense of justice and principles and thus recommended him to the Queen: "His speech, equally poignant and logical, could hardly be surpassed for trenchant argument, voice good, delivery good; and when you take into consideration also his youth, his social position, and his great name—and these are qualities which in public life cannot be disconnected with the individual. It was impossible not to recognise him as one whom Your Majesty has a right to look to for valuable service." (Quoted in his Biography). Although his resignation spoiled his relations with Gladstone for a time, but the latter never forgot his high sense of duty and in 1883 offered him the Governor Generalship of Canada, which he accepted. After his return from

Canada in 1888 he was offered the viceroyalty of India and he accepted the offer. He reached Bombay on the 3rd of December, 1888 and took up the charge of his office from Lord Dufferin on the 10th of the same month at Calcutta.

During his tenure of office Lord Lansdowne extensively toured the country, visiting the provinces of Punjab, Madras and Bombay and the States of Rajasthan, Bhopal, Indore, Hyderabad and Mysore. He cultivated good relations with various Indian rulers and kept himself fully acquainted with the latest developments in the country.

He continued the policy of his predecessor both in his internal and external affairs. Immediately after his assumption of charge he took up the Indian Council Bill with the Home Government. He stressed upon the Secretary of State the desirability of the enlargement of the legislative councils and the inclusion in them of a few representatives of the educated classes. Lord Cross, however, did not give him an encouraging reply. He wrote, "I wish we could give you a better account of the prospect of the Indian Council Bill. But it is threatened both by general and special symptoms, and its case is almost desperate." Lord Salisbury also frankly admitted that so long as Gladstone led the opposition benches he was not inclined to take up any further extension of privileges to the Indians in the Legislative Councils. Many members of the Conservative Party were opposed to the proposal and there were no strong supporters. Lord Lansdowne, however, did not give up his efforts and kept on pleading for more concessions to the Indians. His efforts bore fruit and in 1892 a Bill was introduced in the Parliament which, after approval, became the Indian Council Act of 1892. By this Act the Legislative Council of the Viceroy was further enlarged and the number of additional members was raised to sixteen. The provincial councils were similarly enlarged. The number of members in the councils of Bombay and Madras was to range between eight and twenty. The councils of Bengal and the N.W.P. could have a maximum number of twenty councillors. Out of sixteen members of the Viceroy's Council six were to be officials and ten non-officials. Of the ten non-officials five were to be nominated by the Central Government and the other five were to represent the Chamber of Commerce and the four provinces of Bengal, Bombay, Madras and N.W.P. The Legislative Council was given more privileges and powers. It could discuss the budget and

make suggestions. The council could also take up some administrative matters and give their opinion on various matters of public interest. In the beginning the Viceroy and his Executive Council did not give much weight to the views of the members of the Legislative Council. However, with the passage of time, when the representatives of the educated classes began to join the Legislative Council, some really significant reforms and amendments were suggested.

The Concessions contained in the Indian Council Act of 1892 should have been given to the Indians much earlier and with better grace, as had once been proposed by Lord Dufferin in his despatches to the Home Government. The agitation for the enlargement of the Council and the introduction of other reforms had been going on since 1861, *i.e.*, since the passing of the first Councils Act. The realisation among the Indians of their economic exploitation wherever their interests clashed with those of the British and attempt by the Government to debar Indians from the high posts during the period of Lord Lytton, gave further impetus to this movement. Lord Ripon and Lord Dufferin encouraged the Indians in their demands. As a result the agitation grew so strong that the British Government could not withhold the reform of the Council much longer. Unfortunately, even the Council Act of 1892 could not satisfy the Indians due to the over-cautious policy of the Home Government. They had been agitating for direct representation through elections which the Government was not inclined to agree. Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, considered this demand as dangerous. In the reformed Council the members could now ask questions on various issues but it was not obligatory for the Viceroy and his Executive Council to give a reply. It was unfair, as it took away the significance of the concession given by the Government. The people complained also of the insignificant number of representatives they were allowed to send through the provincial governments. Indirectly elected non-official members from the Provincial Councils had a hopeless minority of five in a house of twenty-five in the Central Legislative Council. Punjab was not yet represented as it had no Legislative Council of its own. In one of its resolutions, the Indian National Congress regarded it as an incomplete measure and wanted to "Put on regard the facts that alike in the rules of the Government of India and the Practice of most of the local govern-

ments, notably in that of the Government of Bombay, material alterations are necessary if real effect is to be given to the spirit of this Act and that the Punjab, one of the most important provinces in the Empire, is still denied the right to be represented either in the Viceroy's or in the Local Council".

During the period of the viceroyalty of Lord Lansdowne, India was visited by many important personages. The envoy from China came to represent his country over the Sikkim question. Two princes of Russia visited India in 1891. The Governor General of the French Settlements in India also visited Calcutta and was accorded a grand reception.

Unfortunately Lord Lansdowne did not get full support from Lord Cross, the Secretary of State to his proposed reforms in administration. The Home Government did not agree to his Jury Bill: It proposed to reform the existing jury system and to withhold certain offences from the jurisdiction of the jury. There was, however, a great agitation against this policy and the Home Government felt obliged to appoint a commission to go through its details. The Home Government also appointed a commission to examine the question of opium trade. In 1892 there was a change of governments in England and Gladstone came into power. Lord Cross was replaced by Lord Kimberly from whom Lord Lansdowne did not encounter much opposition. His recommendation for the appointment of Sir George White as the new commander-in-chief in India was accepted by the Home Government.

In his foreign policy Lord Lansdowne had to face a difficult situation both on the north-eastern and the north-western frontier. In the north-east there was a disturbance in the state of Manipur. Its ruler was dethroned by his younger brother who was supported by commander-in-chief of the State forces. The new ruler set up by the commander-in-chief proved incompetent. The British Government accepted the new government but advised its political agent in Manipur to get the commander-in-chief exiled on the charge of murder. The political agent failed in his mission as he was not strong enough for the purpose. Lord Lansdowne instructed Quinton, the Chief Commissioner of Assam, to go with a force to Manipur to get the orders of the Central Government complied with. The Commander-in-chief came to know of the plan, inveigled the Chief Commissioner into an interview and got him murdered treacherously.

The persons responsible for the murder were arrested and hanged under instructions from the Governor General. The commander-in-chief himself was also hanged in public. The incident came to the notice of the House of Commons and there was a great agitation against the action of the Viceroy. Lord Lansdowne justified his action in a strongly-worded despatch to the Secretary of State but the Queen remained unconvinced and desired that in future before imparting such punishment the Home Government must be consulted.

The situation on the north-western borders was equally unsatisfactory. Abdur Rehmann, the Amir of Afghanistan, had been estranged by the British Government. He felt irritated over the extension of the railway line up to Chaman and the growing influence of the British Government in the tribal areas of the North Western Frontier Province. Lord Dufferin had been very considerate in his attitude towards the Amir and had even tried to appease him. Lord Lansdowne held quite a different view. He thought that the British Government had every right to snub him if he was found unreasonable and going beyond his limits. In one of his despatches he wrote that there was no harm in being very liberal with the Amir of Kabul in the matter of giving assistance to him but it should be on a reciprocal basis. The Amir should also be accommodating and considerate in his attitude towards the British Government. He added that the British Government should not stand any nonsense from him. Lord Lansdowne had a firm opinion that the policy of too much appeasement had turned him into arrogant ally. The Amir, according to him, had let loose a reign of terror in his country and the British Government was responsible and answerable for all his actions as he had been placed on the throne of Kabul with the British assistance and was even being maintained by them. When the Amir was told by Lord Lansdowne that he should not be so cruel towards his subjects, he felt offended because he thought that the British Government had no right to interfere in his internal affairs. The Amir, according to Macmunn, "Pursued his way, purging the administration to the end that rough justice should prevail, and that the king's revenues should find their way to the king's coffers. And woe betide any who said the Amir nay. The knife and the rope, the cannon's mouth and poison bowl, between them rid the land of all who, in Abdur Rahman's opinion, were

inimical to the interests of Afghanistan as personified in himself." When the Amir was told that he was very hard to his people he retorted that he had to rule a hard race. Lord Lansdowne did not have any further correspondence with him but to ensure the security of the borders of India he visited Peshawar, Khyber Pass and Jullaha Quetta. He inspected the British posts on the borders to see that the British defences were in a proper condition and in the case of an emergency could withstand any attack from outside.

In 1891 Lord Salisbury informed the Viceroy of the impending danger of the Russian aggression over Persia and asked him if the Indian Government could take up the protection of the Persian Government against this danger. Lord Lansdowne frankly replied to the Prime Minister that with the meagre resources at his disposal, it was impossible for him to undertake this responsibility. However, if Home Government could reinforce the Indian forces, the action could be taken. In 1892 the Queen also showed her concern about Afghan relations and wrote to the Viceroy. The Viceroy informed the Home Government that the Amir had been estranged on account of the interference of the British Government in the tribal areas and over the extension of the British railways to the frontier posts. He added that the Amir was not trustworthy and had a wrong notion that the British Government could not afford to stand by its commitments made to him. This was the result, primarily, of the inaction of the British Government on different occasions when instead of taking strong action it had been content with sending only letters of protests. Continuous assistance both in money and material, without any attempt at interference in his internal affairs, and a promise of protection of his borders against an unprovoked aggression by Russia, had helped the Amir to establish himself strongly. He wanted to extend his sway over Waziristan, Chitral and Bajaur by annexing these territories to his own country, which the British Government resisted. This estranged their mutual relations. Lord Lansdowne was not in favour of precipitating a crisis in his diplomatic relations with the Amir and suggested sending a mission under General Roberts. Abdur Rehman suspected that the mission would be coming to his country to coerce him into submission. He immediately despatched Salterpyre, a British national, in March, 1893, to the Viceroy to acquaint him with the Amir's views. Salterpyre told the Viceroy that the Amir was inclined even to go to England and had also requested for permission to the supply of rifles through India. Lord Lansdowne

did not want to allow Abdur Rehman to go to England as he feared that his meeting with the Queen and the grand reception which he would get would make him more unreasonable in his attitude. The Secretary of State agreed with this proposal. The Amir was, therefore, dissuaded from a visit to England. Lord Lansdowne dropped the idea of sending General Roberts. However, a small mission under Sir Mortimer Durand was despatched to settle the border disputes and such other problems as had estranged the Amir. Sir Durand was successful in his mission and the border between Afghanistan and India was demarcated. It was known in history as the 'Durand Line.' The Amir had to cede some territories. He was duly compensated for this concession and his annual subsidy was raised from twelve lakhs to eighteen lakhs. Cordial relations between the two Governments were restored.

Lord Lansdowne left for England in January, 1894.

EARL OF ELGIN (1894—1899)

Lord Elgin was born on the 16th of May, 1849 at Montreal in Canada. His father was then the Governor General of Canada. He received his education at Glenalmond and Eton. He was appointed the Treasurer of Household and then the first Commissioner of Works in the Gladstone Ministry in 1886. In 1893 he was appointed as Viceroy of India. He reached Bombay early in 1894. It was generally felt in England that Lord Elgin who had no experience of the Indian affairs, had been appointed as Viceroy to compensate him for the untimely death of his father in India a year after his appointment to the same post. It was anticipated that Lord Elgin would have a peaceful time and, therefore, it was not necessary to select a man particularly experienced in the eastern affairs. But Lord Elgin had to face very hard times in India. Hostilities broke out on the north western borders of India and there was a spate of natural calamities like the famines and plague which took a very big toll of the human lives and completely dislocated the administrative machinery. The Viceroy was so much disturbed by all these problems that he never had a peaceful sleep throughout his term of office in India.

Immediately on his arrival Lord Elgin had to despatch Sir Mortimer Durand, Indian Foreign Secretary, to Kabul to reach some

settlement with the Afghan Government on the boundary between India and Afghanistan. Sir Durand was received on the Afghan border by Ghulam Haider Khan, a great general of Afghanistan, escorted to Kabul and introduced to the Amir on the 15th of October, 1894. The Amir was very friendly during the interview and his cooperation and sincerity helped Sir Mortimer Durand to make an early demarcation of the Indo-Afghan border. The territories of Chitral and Gilgit were readily handed over by the Amir to the British. He also agreed not to claim the territories inhabited by the tribes of Bajouris, Afridis and Waziris. However, he warned the British that they would experience great difficulty in the maintenance of control over these tribes which had never allowed others to live in peace. These people were fanatically attached to their freedom and religion. The British accepted the claims of Abdur Rehman, the Amir, over Asmar and Dermal. They received the territories of Yaghistan, popularly known as the no-man's land. These regions had never known any regular government and had enjoyed an independent position. The annual subsidy to the Amir was increased from Rupees twelve lakhs to Rupees eighteen lakhs for all these concessions. Sir Mortimer Durand, on his return gave a very satisfactory report on Afghan affairs.

Abdur Rehman was anxious to develop direct relations with England rather than through the intermediary of the Viceroy in India. Accordingly he sent his son Nasirullah to England to explore the possibility of a direct alliance with the British Government. Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, told him frankly that it would be advisable for the Amir to channel all his correspondence through Indian Government. The prince had to return to Kabul disappointed.

Lord Elgin was also fortunate to reach an amicable settlement of the boundary line with the Russians and the Chinese. A joint boundary commission consisting of a representative each of Russia, England and Afghanistan demarcated the boundary lines common to the three countries.

The mission of Sir Mortimer Durand was quite successful, but the sinister warning given by the Amir of Afghanistan also came out to be very true. The British had a very hard time in the tribal areas which they got as a result of the demarcation of the boundary with the Governments of Afghanistan, Russia and China. In 1895, there was a great uprising in Chitral. Mehtar Nizam-ul-Mulk, the chief of these territories, was murdered by Amir-ul-Mulk, his

brother. The latter could not rule the country peacefully as his claim to the throne was disputed by Umra Khan of Jandol. Amir-ul-Mulk declared in favour of his nephew Sher Afzal. The result was that a civil war began in the territory. Sher Afzal enlisted the support of the neighbouring tribes and collected a large army. He attacked Chitral, captured it and then laid siege to the British Residency. The besieged offered a tough resistance and simultaneously requested for immediate reinforcement from India. A British army was accordingly despatched to Chitral. Sher Afzal was defeated and sent to India as a prisoner and Chitral was included in the British territories. A minor child was declared as the chief of the territory with the administration controlled by the British Resident.

Situation in other regions was equally inflammable. These had also been newly added to the British Empire and had never before been visited by a European. The tribal Afghan chiefs considered themselves beyond the reach of the British and rose up in revolt. The waziris were the first of these Afghan tribes to revolt in November, 1894. Sir William Lockhard proved too strong for them and after a severe fighting lasting for more than two months, the Waziris were forced to lay down their arms and to submit to the British authority in January, 1895.

The Swatis were the next to break into an open revolt in 1897. Sir Bindon Blood engaged them in a bloody battle and after inflicting severe losses on them forced them to submit. Afridis were the next to rise in revolt in the Khyber region. They captured the pass and declared a Jihad on the British. The Government of India realised the gravity of the situation, as the Afridis were the strongest of the tribes in the North-Western frontier regions. They had a big following and could easily collect over a hundred thousand fighters. The declaration of Jihad was to make their tribe all the more formidable. Sir William Lockhard informed the Viceroy that a small force would not serve the purpose. Therefore, the native states were asked to send their contingents. A strong army of about 60,000 soldiers was collected. Sir William Lockhard personally led this army against the Afridis. Several bloody engagements took place in which both the sides suffered very heavy casualties. At last the Afridis gave up resistance and submitted. The Viceroy was determined to put down their resistance once for all and to render them incapable of rising in future. They were forced to acknowledge the exclusive control of the British Government over the Khyber Pass. The British Government con-

nected it with the Indian railway system and set up a very strong fort at Lundikotal where a strong British army was posted. Although Lord Elgin was successful against all these frontier tribes yet he could not claim that he had subdued them permanently. These tribesmen were devoted to their liberty and never liked foreign interference in their internal affairs. They remained a constant headache for the British Government which could never succeed in maintaining an effective control over these regions.

Lord Elgin had also to deal with an equally pressing problem of a famine which raged in the provinces of Rajputana, N.W.P., the Central Provinces, the Punjab and Oudh. In spite of his best efforts to overcome this natural calamity he found that his resources were limited. The Government exerted itself to the utmost to alleviate the distress and sufferings of the people with the meagre resources at its disposal. Earlier, Lord Lytton had drawn up a very extensive famine relief programme. But Lord Elgin, from his personal experience, came to the conclusion that in spite of all precautions and efforts of the Government such calamities could not be overcome easily. He, therefore, thought it expedient that the Government should have a reserve stock of food to meet this challenge.

While a famine was raging in many provinces and the attention of the Government was wholly absorbed in dealing with it, another calamity appeared in Bombay in the form of epidemic of plague in 1896. It soon spread over the whole of the city and many people in a terror fled to the neighbouring regions. The epidemic spread to Poona and Karachi where also an equally large number of people fell a prey to this disease. The Government tried to acquaint the people with various precautions but these were not appreciated by them and they did not cooperate with the Government properly. Even the native press became hostile and began to write against the Government's attitude towards the dying persons. The Viceroy and the Government officials tried in vain to impress upon the people that they were their friends and were trying their best to save their lives from the terrible disease. The famine and plague took a very high toll and, in spite of its best efforts, the Government could not get any appreciation. Rather it became unpopular among the masses who attributed these calamities to the foreign rule. It took two years for the situation to become normal. The cities became desolate. Thousands of dead bodies of the victims could be seen here and there.

In spite of his best intentions, Lord Elgin could not win the hearts of the commoo people. However, he did gain the good-will of the ruling princes and the educated classes of India who considered him a very considerate, just, industrious but a shy and silent worker. He returned to England in 1899 and held other important posts till 1917 when he died at Bromhall. Viscount Mersey justifiably writes about him, "His lot in India fell in evil times; but he had a fine tradition of public service which he thoroughly fulfilled with modest and honest distinction."

MARQUESS OF CURZON (1899—1905)

Lord Curzon was born on the 11th of January, 1859 at Kedleston Hall, Derbyshire and belonged to a family which had been enjoying very proud traditions for the past several centuries. He was educated at Eton and before entering Parliament as a Conservative Member in 1886 he had toured the greater part of Europe and the eastern world and gained a thorough insight into the political and social institutions particularly of eastern countries. He became so renowned for his knowledge of the eastern world that he was appointed as an Under secretary for the Indian affairs in 1891. Next year he visited Afghanistan and on his return to England he was posted as an Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He held this post till his appointment as the Viceroy in India in August 1898. He had his own views and convictions about the political affairs in the eastern countries and always asserted himself even as an Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Lord Salisbury, under whom he worked as an Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, thus once remarked about him. "He was not always an easy or docile lieutenant to his chief nor a popular colleague, but his talents, industry and information were indisputable."

His appointment as the Viceroy of India was hailed both in England and India. He landed in Bombay on the 30th of December, 1898 and took over the charge of his office on the 3rd of January 1899. Unlike his predecessor, he restrained himself in making promises to the people in his maiden speech as the Viceroy. But in actual practice he left no stone unturned to improve the working of the Government and to introduce measures for a better and more efficient administration. After a few months' study of the papers in different departments, he remarked that his predecessors had left

everything for him to decide. He followed a strong policy for the protection of Indian borders both on the north-west and the north-east and introduced various reforms in the departments of education, agriculture, irrigation and currency. He thoroughly re-organised the existing bureaucratic system. Civil service leave rules were framed under his direction. He also set up a new archaeological department, a library at Calcutta, and training colleges for the Indians to get military training. He opened several cooperative credit societies and separated the judiciary from the executive.

Both the north-western and the north-eastern frontiers demanded his immediate attention. First of all, he had to deal with the tribal lands between the extreme northern agency of the Indian Government and Afghanistan. He was not inclined to block up a large number of his forces on the north-western borders. In the tribal areas he favoured the establishment of a militia under the administration of the British Government through some of its able officers. He did not like to pay subsidy to the tribal chiefs; rather he wanted to enlist them into the British service. The Militia was to be responsible both for the maintenance of the internal administration and also for the defence of their borders. He did not like the fortification or the sealing off of the borders by spending a lot of money. The new measures led to a saving of about Rs. 6 lakhs a year. All the Indian armies were withdrawn from the border and their control was entrusted to the administrative unit of the North-Western Frontier Province. He personally toured the frontier region to see the working of his new scheme. The tribal chiefs were also plainly told that any depredations or hostile attitude on their part would be severely dealt with. During his visit to Quetta he explained to the tribal chiefs the importance of new roadways being constructed up to Seistan. He informed the local chiefs that they would gain a lot by their friendship with the British. His frankness created a good impression over the tribal chiefs. He also visited places like Dehra Ghazi Khan, Bannu and Kohat and tried his utmost to effect economy and to reduce the number of forces, wherever possible.

The tribal regions, which separated the Punjab and Sind from Afghanistan were being administered by a Chief Commissioner who used to get instructions from the Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab. In some cases, he could also directly write to the Viceroy. Lord Curzon did not favour this dual control and stressed upon the Home

Government the necessity of having a central control over these regions. His proposal was appreciated and in September 1900 the Cabinet agreed to the formation of a North-Western Frontier Province in 1901 which was to be directly administered by the Central Government. The Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab felt very sour with this change as he lost his hold over the Chief Commissioner of the frontier region.

Lord Curzon also visited the north-eastern frontier. After a tour of Assam he considered that undue importance had been given to the Mishmi expedition and a lot of money had been unnecessarily wasted on it. He did not want to extend boundaries of British India on the north-eastern side. He visited the State of Manipur and in his address at Imphal impressed upon the people of the State the importance of their relations with the British Government. He did not approve of the proposal for building a fort in the State of Manipur for the protection of the British people. He visited Burma and on his return to Calcutta wrote a strong letter to the Home Government against spending any money out of the Indian Exchequer for the construction of railways in Burma and for connecting Burma with the southern China. He interested himself in the affairs of the political agencies in the extreme north and rejected the proposal of the Political Officer at Gilgit for the building of a road up to Chitral. He also did not allow the Political Officer, Tochi, to spend an amount of Rs. 35,000 on the improvement of the military hutments. By all these measures he not only effected economy in the expenditure but also introduced measures which strengthened the frontiers.

Lord Curzon did not like the influence of Russia in Afghanistan. He had earlier visited Afghanistan as a Member of Parliament and had cultivated intimate relations with Prince Habib-ullah Khan. In October, 1901 Amir Abdur Rehman died after a long and prosperous rule of about sixteen years. He was succeeded by Habib-ullah Khan. It was apprehended that a war of succession might begin. Therefore, the Home Government enjoined upon the Viceroy not to make any move in Afghanistan without their approval. Lord Curzon strongly felt that the Afghan Government should not be allowed to drift towards Russia and only England should have the right to interfere in its affairs. He sent a personal letter to Habib-ullah Khan wherein he reminded him of his past friendship and requested him for reaching an agreement with the British Government. Habib-

Ullah Khan did not like to depart from the policy followed by his predecessor. Therefore, he avoided a meeting with Lord Curzon who in the long run felt disappointed at his indifferent attitude. The only letter received from the Amir was at the time when he apprehended a Russian attack due to the extension of their railway up to the Afghan border. Lord Curzon suggested the extension of the Indian railway and telegraph lines up to Afghan capital so that the Afghans could be sent assistance at the earliest, whenever an emergency arose. The Amir did not appreciate the idea. He wanted British assistance only in money and material. He did not favour the presence of a British army in his country as it would have made his own position very unstable in the eyes of his countrymen. He did not like to develop further relations with the British Government. Faced with this reluctant attitude, Lord Curzon imposed some restrictions on the supply of war material to Afghanistan through India. In 1903 Lord Curzon wrote a very strong letter to the Amir wherein he reminded him of his obligation towards the British Government and asked him to desist from leaning towards Russia. He also requested the Home Government to adopt a strong policy towards the Amir. In one of his despatches he thus wrote to the Home Government, "If you allow a man and a State of his calibre to flout the British Empire, then we had better put up shutters and close business." The Home Government, however, did not agree as it could lead to a crisis which they wanted the least. Fortunately, the Amir changed his attitude. He sent a satisfactory reply. However, he did not accept the invitation of the Viceroy for a joint meeting. Without imposing any conditions, the British Government resumed payment of the subsidy to the Amir. In 1905 a mission was also sent to Afghanistan and a treaty of friendship was signed. Lord Curzon felt humiliated at this policy as the British and not the Amir had to ask for a treaty.

The British did not like the growing influence of France or Russia in Persia. They held strong possessions in the Persian Gulf and felt that they should immediately increase their influence over the whole of southern Persia if the Russians tried to increase their influence in the northern Persia. The French were also keen to meddle in the Persian affairs. They tried to gain for themselves a 'coaling station' in southern Persia. There were loud protests both in India and England. It was felt that the Persian Government, the chief of Muscat or other chiefs of the Persian Gulf had no right to grant any

concessions to any European nation as it was against the obligations of their treaty with England. The Sultan of Muscat was threatened with a strong military action and the French were not allowed to have any base in his country. Lord Curzon differed with the Home Government in regard to the influence of Russia in Persia. He considered that the British had supreme rights and interests in Persia. Therefore, there could be no question of a compromise with any other European nation either on political or commercial grounds in Persia. He held that, "It should be a cardinal axiom of British policy that Her Majesty's Government will not acquiesce in any European power and more especially Russia, over-running central and southern Persia and reaching the Gulf, or requiring naval facilities in the latter even without such territorial connections." Lord Curzon suggested that Persia should be made a strong power with the help of England. The second alternative suggested by Lord Curzon was that England should come to an understanding with Russia to demarcate the Zones of influence between the two countries. If the Russians did not agree even to this proposal then the only way left open for England was to capture the whole of southern Persia if the Russians advanced upon northern Persia. The Home Government did not agree with these proposals because they considered that they were not strong enough in Persia to engage in a fight with Russia. The strong protests of Curzon did not bring any change in the British attitude towards Russia in Persia. Rather he got a rebuff from the Secretary of State in a strong note that he was unnecessarily championing the cause of Persia when he did not have even an army which could defend India against a foreign aggression. Lord Curzon, however, went on protesting. When he heard of the proposed visit of the Shah of Persia to England, he requested the Home Government to discuss with him not to allow the Russians to have any port in the Persian Gulf. He informed the Home Government that whenever the Russians advanced in northern Persia he could immediately capture Seistan. However, the Russians never seriously challenged the British authority in southern Persia. When the British protested against their sending a fleet in the Persian Gulf, the Russians withdrew and dropped the idea of having a base in the Persian Gulf. They informed the British Government that they had no mind to have a port in the Persian Gulf or to extend their railways in the eastern Persia. Lord Curzon personally visited Persian Gulf and cemented good relations with the Persian Chiefs.

The States of Tibet and Sikkim had common borders. While the former was a tributary state under China, the latter owed its allegiance to the British Government in India. Their border disputes had been settled by a Convention in 1890 of the representatives of Indian and Chinese Governments. The Tibetans refused to recognise this agreement and by infringing it forced the British Government in India to propose an expedition to Lhasa, the capital of Tibet. The Home Government did not like the idea as they were afraid of the development of another crisis on the northern borders of India. Lord Curzon also wrote to the Government of China but the latter regretted their inability in the matter. Lord Curzon wrote direct to Dalai Lama but the latter did not reply. He apprehended that the silence of Dalai Lama might be due to the Russian influence in that country. He requested the Home Government to come to an understanding with Russia on the question of Tibet. But the Home Government did not accept the suggestion. During his visit to Darjeeling Lord Curzon paid a cursory visit to the Tibetan borders. The Political Officer explained to the Viceroy that as the Tibetans were not represented at the Convention of 1890, they did not feel themselves bound to honour it. Lord Curzon, therefore, suggested the despatch of a mission to Lhasa to explore possibilities for another agreement with the Government of Tibet. He wrote to the Home Government in the matter, but the latter did not favour the proposed mission. The Tibetans too did not like the interference of the British in their country. However, Lord Curzon prevailed upon the Home Government to permit him to arrange a meeting with the Tibetan representatives to arrive at some settlement regarding the boundary line between Tibet and the state of Sikkim as well as for opening some trading stations for the British in Tibet. The meeting was to be held at some place half way from Lhasa. A mission was, therefore, sent at Khambajong under Colonel Young Husband. The Tibetans did not turn up at the appointed place. The British Mission advanced towards Lhasa. The Tibetans obstructed it and an engagement took place at Guru on the 31st March, 1904, wherein 600 Tibetans were killed. Colonel Young Husband advanced upon Lhasa and reached there on the 3rd of August, 1904. The Tibetan Government was forced to sue for terms and to keep a British resident at Lhasa, to surrender the Chumbi Valley, to destroy their fortifications between Lhasa and the extreme

North Indian posts, to allow no foreigners except the British in their country, to allow the British to establish trading stations at various places in Tibet and to pay a war indemnity of Rs. 25 lakhs. A copy of this agreement was forwarded to the Viceroy who transmitted it to the Home Government. The Home Government did not agree to the maintenance of a British Resident at Lhasa or to the payment of the huge war indemnity by the Tibetans which they felt the Tibetans could not afford to pay. It was also decided that the Chumbi Valley should be returned to the Tibetans after the British had established their trading stations in Tibet.

Lord Curzon had the knack of selecting the best men for every job. He could distinguish between the efficient and the inefficient very quickly. He could not stand inefficiency and snubbed the inefficient persons. At the same time, he appreciated the work of the deserving and intelligent persons. He had high opinion about Jenkin, who later on became prominent as Sir Lawrence Jenkin, and Captain Roo-s-Keppel who later on became known as Sir George Roo-s-Kepple. With a view to introducing an efficient system of administration he partitioned the province of Bengal. Again, it was for ensuring an efficient system of administration that the Calcutta Corporation Act was passed at his initiative. One of the chief causes of his unpopularity was his efficiency drive. He did not like the existing bureaucratic set up and wanted to overhaul it completely. He was very honest and never forgot the interests of the Indians so long he was in India. He refused to meet any expenditure out of the Indian exchequer on the Indians who visited England during the Coronation of King Edward VII. Similarly, he refused to spend any amount from the Indian fund for the construction of railway in Burma. He also refused to pay any amount towards the expenses of the war fought in Africa. He also tried to reduce the expenses on different departments of the administration as well as on the maintenance of the army on the borders of India. His economies and his personal attention to the minutest details of expenditure on various schemes helped the government to show a surplus budget and also to give the people a relief in taxation. He also introduced several reforms in the administration. Once he remarked that the government had two obligations towards the people. Firstly, it should always see that they were content, happy and prosperous, and secondly, it should look after the security of their lives and property.

Lord Curzon was the first Viceroy who thought in terms of appointing Indians to the high posts of trust in the army. Several military colleges were opened for training the children of the native rulers and the rich for the responsible positions in the army. He spent money on the education of the people and the development of various public works of utility. He also reduced the tax on salt which was an article of common consumption.

Lord Curzon toured the country extensively to make himself acquainted with the problems of the people and to give relief to the people who suffered a lot from famines and epidemics. In 1899 he toured Punjab, Rajputana and Bombay. He visited Kathiawar where a famine was raging. He toured Poona, Ahmedabad and Nasik where plague had broken out. He inspected the medical arrangements and the relief measures made by the Provincial Government for the famine-stricken people. He realised the gravity of the situation and declared that it was, "the obligation of the Government to spend its last rupee in the saving of human life and in the mitigation of extreme human sufferings." He also visited Agra, Kanpur, Fatehpur Sikri and Lucknow and on his way met various native chiefs with whom he cemented good relations. On his return to Calcutta he gave his serious attention to the various schemes of irrigation to mitigate the sufferings of the people.

Lord Curzon appointed a committee to report on the land policy of the country. Although the commission consisted of many experienced officers, yet their report was considered by the Viceroy as a confusing one. He wanted to introduce a liberal and easily intelligible system. Therefore, in consultation with his experts he himself prepared a report which was clear of the ambiguities and the complexities. It was approved by the Secretary of State and introduced. Ronaldshay, the biographer of Lord Curzon, writes, "It was at once recognised as a notable State document bearing the impress of a master hand—as, indeed, the most important pronouncement on land revenue policy since Lord Canning's famous scheme of forty years before for conferring a freehold throughout the country." Lord Curzon also looked after the welfare of the agriculturists who represented the majority of the Indian population. Unfortunately, the agriculturists had been hard-pressed by the village money-lenders who advanced them money at an exorbitant rate of interest. With the help of the law the latter had been gradually taking away

the lands of the agriculturists thereby reducing them into mere cultivators. In the Punjab the problem had assumed alarming proportions and much land had passed out of the hands of the agriculturists. Lord Curzon was not against the money-lending system but he was against the high rate of interest. In 1900 he introduced a bill which became known as Punjab Land Alienation Act. Its aim was to save the agriculturists from the clutches of the money-lenders. By this Act the Government opened Agricultural Cooperative Credit Societies all over the country which were to advance loans to the agriculturists at a reasonable rate of interest. The benefits of the new system were realised by the agriculturists by and by and this also forced the village money-lender to modify his terms of lending. Lord Curzon also established a new department of agriculture under the Central Government and appointed a senior officer known as Inspector General of Agricultural Department to look after its work. An Institute was opened at Pusa in Bihar for carrying out research in agriculture. Land revenue amounting to about Rupees twenty-three lakhs was remitted during his period of tenure in various famine-stricken areas. Lord Curzon also paid attention to the development of the irrigational system with the primary purpose of helping the Government to combat famine in the country. A commission went into the details of this problem and it was decided to spend an amount of three crore sterling during the next twenty years on various Irrigational schemes. The water of the various rivers was utilised by means of canals and storage works for the cultivation of the soil. The area under cultivation increased by 6½ million acres.

During his convocation address in 1900, delivered at Calcutta University, Lord Curzon pointed out the various shortcomings in the educational system and his keen desire to reorganise it. The underlying idea of the existing system was to produce English knowing persons in India to man the junior subordinate service in the country. It was purely academic without any technical or commercial bias. The university education had been planned in a haphazard way. The universities took no interest in the development of the education and played the role of merely examining bodies. Even the students were taught from the point of view of examinations. Lord Curzon convened a conference of the representatives of the various universities and other educational authorities from all over the country at Simla. He suggested the necessity of having a

rigid control on the educational system through a Director General of Education appointed by the Government of India. The conference passed several resolutions. A university education commission was appointed to report on the conditions of the universities. Consequent on its recommendations, an Act was passed in March, 1904, which imposed restrictions on the autonomy of the universities. A Director General was appointed to plan their system of education. Education became a State subject. There was a great agitation against these new reforms but Lord Curzon refused to rescind his decision. Although his policy made him unpopular, it was responsible for a tremendous progress in the propagation of education in the country. The educational legislation of 1904, according to Ronaldshay, the biographer of Lord Curzon, "Reorganised the governing bodies of the universities; invested them with teaching power; laid down conditions to be observed by all colleges seeking affiliation to a university; required, amongst other things, that every college should be under the control of a governing body, in which the representatives of the teachers must be included, that hostel accommodation should be provided for such students as did not reside with their parents or guardians, and that the whole of the college income should be expended for the purpose for which these institutions ostensibly existed."

During his tour of various parts of India, Lord Curzon had come across several historical monuments. These were in a sad state of neglect and disrepair. His proposal for the appointment of a Director of Archaeology was approved by the Home Government. A very comprehensive programme was drawn up under his supervision and arrangements were made to preserve important historical places at Ajanta, Elora, Sanchi, Brindaban, Agra, Fatehpur Sikri, Somnath, Junagarh, Bijapur, Madura and Trichinopoly. In 1904 Ancient Monument Preservation Act was passed. The Government spent an amount of thirty thousands pounds a year, which was later on increased for the exploration, preservation and restoration of these buildings. Lord Curzon described this work as "An offering of reverence to the past and gift of recovered beauty to the future". He contributed personally to make these buildings more beautiful. The pains which he took to decorate the Taj Mahal at Agra a beautiful lamp he had purchased from Egypt and the temple at Amritsar with a clock, shows his keen interest in archaeological remains.

Calcutta Corporation Act was another measure which evoked great agitation and made Lord Curzon more unpopular among the Indians. When Lord Curzon came to India the members of the Calcutta Corporation represented to him that they wanted to change the existing system with a view to bringing efficiency in the administration of the Corporation. It was suggested that the administration of the Corporation should be entrusted to a committee having a majority of European members. Lord Curzon did not like the idea. He wanted to reduce the number of the members of the Corporation and to set up a small body of Indians and Europeans sincerely interested in good administration. Under the new arrangements the Europeans were to be in majority. There was a great opposition from the Indian members who found in this measure the means of depriving them of the right of local self-government which had been bestowed upon them a few years before. Twenty-eight members of the Corporation resigned their membership in protest against the new arrangements. The vernacular newspapers protested against this measure. The Indian National Congress criticised the Government for this high-handed policy. It had never been the idea of Lord Curzon to deprive the people of their right of local autonomy. He only desired to introduce a more efficient system. However, in the face of strong public criticism the Act was amended in 1923 to provide that four-fifths of the members of the Corporation should be elected by the people.

In January 1901, Queen Victoria died after a glorious reign of sixty-four years. Lord Curzon decided to raise a befitting memorial to her at Calcutta. He invited voluntary contributions from the people who responded to the invitation vehemently. The contributions were received from all parts of the country. There were protests from some of the provinces in regard to the selection of the place for the Memorial. Victoria Memorial Hall was built at Calcutta and was opened in 1921. The total amount spent on this was about half a million sterling. Some of the writers have described it as the finest structure since the Mughal times.

It was also decided to celebrate the accession of King Edward VII by holding a Durbar. The Home Government agreed to the celebration of the occasion but there was some difference of opinion about the proposal for the remission of taxation on this occasion as a gift to the country. Lord Curzon planned the arrangements

on the basis of the Durbar already held during the period of Lord Lytton in 1877. He, however, introduced many innovations to make the occasion more impressive. A sum of eighty-four thousand pounds was spent on the celebration of the occasion at Delhi alone. However, the total expense incurred on the celebration of this occasion throughout the country amounted to one lakh eighty thousand sterling. Lord Curzon justified this huge expenditure by saying that "It was in India primarily to bring home to the people of every fragment of the Indian continent the vital fact that under the sovereign they were partners in a harmonious and majestic whole."

Lord Curzon also reformed the existing police system. Great corruption prevailed in the rank and file of the police administration. Lord Curzon blamed low salaries as the main cause of this. He suggested the appointment of a commission to examine the whole system. But the Home Government did not agree to his proposal. He explained to them that he had no other intention behind this reform except to have a purer and a better set up. This was accepted by the Home Government and the proposed reform was carried out. In the long run it produced good results and police became a far better security force than it had been some two to three decades before.

In 1903, Lord Curzon appointed Mr. T. Robertson to report on the conditions of the railways. On the basis of his report, Lord Curzon impressed upon the Home Government the low cost of construction and big profit of the railways in India under private enterprise as compared to that in England under Government management. It was decided to spend a sum of Rupees fifteen crores annually on the construction of new railways and the improvement of the existing ones. Near about a thousand miles of railway lines was planned to be laid every year. Railway Board was set up in India to supervise the working of the railways. This board was a body of the experts which had internal autonomy but was otherwise under the Viceroy in India.

Lord Curzon was in favour of having a tighter control of the Centre over the Governors of the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay. Till then these Governors were appointed by the Home Government and were subordinate to the Viceroy only in certain respects. Lord Curzon had himself complained once that he had no knowledge of the affairs of the two Presidencies and whatever

information he received about these was only from the newspapers. Therefore, he strongly felt the necessity of bringing these governors at par with the governors of other provinces. He also did not favour the continuation of the legislative councils in these provinces. He objected to the privilege of the Governors of these provinces to correspond with the Home Government direct. He also desired that the posts of the governors of Bombay and Madras should be opened to the I.C.S. officers. The Secretary of State was in agreement with the Viceroy but the Cabinet did not agree. On the contrary, the post of the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal was upgraded to that of Governor.

Lord Curzon did not have smooth relations with the Home Government. On many occasions he had the mortification of seeing his proposals rejected. He considered that the Secretary of the State and his Council merely obstructed the Viceroy in the administration of India rather than helping or guiding him. There was an exchange of very spirited correspondence over the question of meeting the expenses of the Indians who had visited England during the Coronation ceremony of Edward VII, over the policy in Persia and Eden, over the construction of railway from Burma to China, over the remission of land revenue to the Indians in connection with the Coronation of Edward VII, over the various reforms introduced by the Viceroy and the status of the Presidencies. The bitterest quarrel he had was over the question of the powers of the Commander-in-Chief. Many a times he threatened to resign his post. In one of his despatches he wrote, "English Government have always had the reputation of breaking the hearts of their pro-consuls from Warren Hastings to Bartle Frere. Do you wish to repeat the performance?"

Another measure which made Lord Curzon very unpopular with the Indians was the partition of Bengal. He considered that the province of Bengal was very unwieldy and it was difficult for a Lieutenant Governor to provide an effective administration over such a vast area. Therefore, he thought of partitioning it in two parts. The people of Bengal misunderstood this measure as a step towards dividing them and repressing their nationalism. The step was equally resented by the newspapers, the legal community and the business community as it would have jeopardized their vested interests in Calcutta. They all joined hands to give a tough opposition to the

new measure of the Viceroy. Lord Curzon personally visited some affected localities and enquired of the people their reasons and arguments for opposing his measure. Instead of partitioning the province into two parts he was told to have a full-fledged Governor in place of a Lieutenant Governor in Bengal and to establish a legislative council similar to those already in existence in Bombay and Madras. Lord Curzon was not convinced with the utility of these suggestions as he had already favoured winding up of the councils at Bombay and Madras. He decided to implement the new measure in the face of every opposition. The Home Government approved it and Bengal was divided into two parts. The new province which consisted of the North-Eastern parts of Bengal and Assam was placed under a Lieutenant Governor with his capital at Dacca. It was to have its own Board of Revenue, Legislative Council and a Judiciary. The new province came into being in September, 1904. However, opposition of the people to the partition grew so strong that the government had to retrace its steps and after a few years, the two parts were reunited into the province of Bengal under a Governor.

On his arrival in India Lord Curzon found the Nizam estranged and sullen because of the British interference into the affairs of Hyderabad and the question of Berar. Under the subsidiary alliance the Nizam was obliged to maintain a British army. He had handed over the territories of Berar to the British for the maintenance of that army. Neither the British army nor the civil officers who controlled the administration of Berar in the name of the Nizam were in fact answerable to him. They were to receive instructions from the British Resident at Hyderabad. With the lapse of time revenues of Berar had increased considerably. But the Nizam was seldom paid more than a limited amount. Lord Curzon thought of arriving at an equitable settlement with the Nizam. Under the new arrangements a fixed rent of Rs. 25 lakhs per annum was to be paid to the Nizam by the British for the territories of Berar. This rent was to be set off against the loan of Rs. 3 crores and fortyone lakhs which the Nizam had taken from the British Government. The Nizam did not like the arrangement in the beginning but when Lord Curzon personally visited him and explained the new arrangements he agreed to it.

Lord Curzon was given an extension by the Home Government in view of his ability and the zeal shown by him in reforming

the administration in India. But he was not destined to complete the second period of his tenure and was obliged to resign a few months later. The reason was his differences with Lord Kitchner, the commander-in-chief of the British army in India. In the council of the Viceroy there used to be a military member, who, although inferior in rank to the commander-in-chief, still had the privilege to comment on the suggestions of the commander-in-chief. Lord Kitchner, the commander-in-chief of the British army in India, refused to accept this position. He had been brought to India at the special request of Lord Curzon and as he was one of the most capable and experienced generals of his time, he enjoyed a special position and respect both in India and in England. He wanted to eliminate the elaborate administrative procedures and to implement his plans for the improvement of the whole of the military administrative system. He wanted to be fully responsible for all the administrative duties of the army. To his chagrin he soon realised that he had no powers except to maintain the discipline in the army. His position was weaker than even the military member of Viceroy's Council who was inferior to him in rank and experience. Many a times he remarked that it would have been better for him to come to India as a military member than as the commander-in-chief of the British forces. Lord Curzon sympathised with him and tried to help him as far as it was possible for him. He requested Lord Kitchner informally to send a copy each of all his schemes to the military member before regularly submitting them for consideration, so that there was no opposition to his stand. Lord Kitchner, however, wanted a complete change of the system rather than save his face by having recourse to indirect methods. He informed the Viceroy that he wanted to be fully responsible for the whole of the military administrative work. Lord Curzon did not agree, as, according to him, the administration of the army should be with the Viceroy. However, he fully agreed with the views of Lord Kitchner about re-organisation and re-distribution. The basic differences with the military member of viceroy's council however, obliged Lord Kitchner to resign shortly afterwards. Lord Curzon did not want him to resign as it would not only have deprived India of the services of a great commander but would have also led to a great agitation against his own Government. Soon afterwards the question of dispensing with the post of the military member cropped up. The Home Government suggested that the military member should in

future be only a military supply member and should guide the Viceroy in military matters. All other powers should be vested in the commander-in-chief. Lord Curzon had a difference of opinion with the Home Government on the appointment of the new member to this post. His nominee was rejected by the Home Government. Lord Curzon thereupon resigned and left India on the 18th of November, 1905 after handing over his charge to Lord Minto.

Lord Curzon's achievements have thus been summarised by his biographer : "From his period of stress and labour has emerged an India better equipped to face the many problems which confront her, stronger and better guarded on her frontiers, with her agriculture, her industries, her commerce, her education, her irrigation, her railways, her armies and her police brought up to a higher state of efficiency, with every section of her administrative machinery in better repair, with her credit re-established, her currency restored, the material prosperity of her people enhanced and their loyalty strengthened." The people, however, could not appreciate the great achievements of the Viceroy as their minds were agitated over some of his reforms and there were many, who, in a spirit of revenge, felt jubilant at his departure. In the long run, the saner element in India did realise the importance of the work done by him and the pains he had taken to improve the lot of the common man in India. An extract from a letter written to him by A.N. Jha many years after he had left India may be quoted as the best example of this trend of opinion, "Now that the ashes of the numerous strifes are cold, all Indians are grateful to the wise statesmanship of the great viceroy who did so much to preserve our ancient monuments and raise our educational standards."

LORD MINTO (1905—1910)

Lord Minto was born in London on the 9th of July, 1845. He had toured Europe during his childhood. He was handsome, well-built, pleasant at conversation and calm. He was very fond of hunting and riding. He had such a great passion for these pursuits that he would even forget to take his meals. Although not very good at studies, he had a very good grasp of various subjects. He was also very fond of natural scenery. He received his education at Eton and Cambridge. He joined army in 1867 where he worked in various capacities. He became the Governor General for Canada

in 1898 and held that post for six years. On his return to England he was selected for appointment as the British Viceroy in India. Lord Minto arrived in Bombay to take up his new assignment on the 17th of November 1905.

Lord Minto realised the hard task he would have to face in India particularly when he was succeeding one of the greatest of the British Viceroys in India. However, he had confidence in himself. This becomes evident from the following extract from one of his addresses : "I am succeeding a brilliant ruler who, in perfecting the machinery of State, has given evidence of abilities and talents which no successor can hope to emulate. And yet my race days have taught me that many a race has been won by giving the horse a rest in his gallops."

Lord Curzon had virtually deprived the whole of the government machinery of its initiative by personally looking into the minutest details of the administration. Lord Minto did not want to leave his Council and the bureaucratic set up of the Government without the feeling of responsibility and initiative. Therefore, gradually he began to pass on the work to them and encouraged them to take decisions independently.

On his arrival at Calcutta on the 22nd of November 1905 Lord Minto received a deputation of the rulers of Patiala, Jind, Nabha and Bahawalpur. He arranged for the reception and stay of Tashi Lama from Tibet. The Prince of Wales was his next guest of honour. It was feared that the Indian National Congress would boycott the reception of the Prince. Lord Minto, therefore, met Gokhale and arrived at an understanding with him with the result that the latter was persuaded to join the reception of the Prince. The Prince was very much impressed and on his return to England, he congratulated the Government for the friendly understanding between them and the people in India. He, however, suggested that the Government should take the Indians more into their confidence and should have still better understanding with them to win over their cooperation.

Soon after Lord Minto's arrival in India the Tories were defeated in elections in England and the Liberals came into power. Unfortunately, Lord Morley, the new Secretary of State, was greedy of power and did not want to share his authority with anybody.

His aim was to convert the Governor General into a cypher who should work only according to his dictates. He had created a terror in the Viceroy's Council which considered him a despot. Lord Minto was a man of patience. As soon as he realised the temperament of Lord Morley he determined to avoid a conflict till his personal honour was at stake or the Secretary of State became very unreasonable in his attitude. He always tried to persuade the Secretary of State with his sound judgement on the various matters and in majority of the cases he did succeed to convince him of his point of view. Lord Minto was tactful enough always to give an impression to Lord Morley that his own orders were being carried out.

Lord Minto had many problems to face after he had taken over the charge of his post. Lord Curzon had resigned in protest against the decision of the Home Government about the authority responsible for the military administration in India. Lord Minto had himself passed the greater part of his earlier career in the army. Therefore, he easily brought an end to the crisis. The old military department was abolished. The army department was divided into two parts. The Commander-in-Chief was given the control of the department of military supply. He was also to look to the discipline of the army and such other problems as could better be taken up by military personnel. It was an amicable settlement and both Lord Minto and Lord Kitchner, the Commander-in-Chief, worked in perfect harmony.

Lord Minto had next to deal with the agitation against the partition of Bengal. He met various political leaders and parties and explained to them the real purpose behind the partition but he could not convince them. As he could not undo the partition of the province, the agitation continued unabated and at times even took a serious turn. The educated people in general felt that the Government were not giving them their due share in the administration of the country. Under the garb of enforcing efficiency Lord Curzon had deprived the Indians of their legitimate share in the administration of the country by barring their appointment to high posts of trust and responsibility. Lord Minto felt that it was neither a sane step nor was it expedient. He wanted to win the confidence of the educated classes because he was convinced that they were not unjustified in their demand. But he was also not blind to the

smouldering fire of the people's demand for self-assertion which had been growing strong everyday. He admitted that, "Beneath a seemingly calm surface there existed a mass of smothered political discontent, much of which was thoroughly justifiable and due to causes which we were bound to examine," and "What the country needs at the moment above everything else is a Government national in spirit, even though it may be foreign in personnel." He became determined to put an end to the agitation by introducing some reforms and giving concessions to the people. On this problem he had a lot of correspondence with the Secretary of State. Both of them realised that it was now necessary to include an Indian in the Executive Council of the Viceroy. They were also favourably disposed towards the proposal for the expansion of the Legislative Councils both at the Centre and in the various provinces. They also conceded that the Indians should be given the right to discuss in detail the budget of the country, express their views on various problems of the country, and, if necessary, move amendments to the decisions of the Government. Lord Minto was, however, determined to suppress any agitation whatsoever with a strong hand. But his views were not shared by some of his lieutenants who were in charge of the administrative machinery of different provinces. They agreed to suppress any agitation which might start in a province but they could not reconcile themselves to giving any concessions to the Indians. Sir Bampfylde Fuller, the Lieutenant Governor of Bengal, could not brook any disturbance in his province. He issued a warning to the management of the aided schools, whose students had joined the agitation in Bengal, that if they permitted their students to participate in this agitation, they would be deprived of the government aid. The management of some schools was helpless to check their students. Therefore when a few cases were reported to the Lieutenant Governor he recommended the withdrawal of government aid from those institutions. Lord Minto was not in favour of this repressive policy and refused to give his assent to it. The Lieutenant Governor threatened to resign on this issue. Surprisingly enough, Lord Minto accepted the resignation of the Lieutenant Governor. The agitation did not remain confined to Bengal for long and soon spread to the Punjab. There was riots at Lahore and Rawalpindi. In Punjab, in addition to the demand for the expansion of the existing Legislative Council, the agitators clamoured for a greater share for the Indians in the

administration of the State. The agitation was also against a Bill passed by the Punjab Government which had adversely affected the colonists in the districts of Lyallpur, Montgomery and Sargodha. Majority of these colonists were retired army personnel who had been allotted vast tracts of land as reward for their military services. These lands had been divided among their children. This process of division had now come to such a stage that it was feared that any further sub-division of the land would lead to a crisis in the life of the colonists as none of them would be in a position to afford a square meal on the income from the small piece of land left with him. The Government, therefore, thought of preventing any further sub-division of the land and, therefore, introduced a Bill in this connection. Although it was framed to serve the interests of the people, it deprived several legitimate claimants of their rights to the land. There was a serious disturbance. Lord Minto also felt that the Punjab Government were not justified in proposing that Bill. Therefore, he withheld his assent to it. The provincial Government represented against this decision of the Viceroy and argued that it would encourage the agitators who would consider it as their victory. Lord Minto retorted against this argument that "I hate the argument that to refuse to sanction what we know to be wrong is a surrender to agitation and an indication of weakness. It is far weaker, to my mind, to persist in a wrong course for fear of being thought weak." The sympathetic attitude of the Viceroy rehabilitated the confidence of the people in the Government. The Government suspected that some Indians, then living in America, were backing this agitation. Lord Minto was determined to suppress it. He forbade the people to hold seditious meetings, and after arresting Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, two revolutionary leaders, exiled them to Mandalay.

There were also disturbances at Madras and in western India. The agitators attacked isolated Britishers in various parts of the country. Lord Minto came to the conclusion that the chief cause of these agitations was the lack of people's confidence in the British Government. He made several recommendations to the Secretary of State with a view to stabilising the position. He suggested the enlargement of the Legislative Councils, inclusion of an Indian in the Viceroy's Executive Council and giving greater share to the Indians in the administration of the State. He also proposed to curb down

the seditious writings of the press which had been creating ill-will against the British Government among the Indians. In his Council he declared, "I am determined that no anarchist crimes will, for any instant, deter me from endeavouring to meet as best I can the political aspirations of honest reformers, and I ask the people of India, and all who have the future welfare of this country at heart, to unite in the support of law and order, and to join in one common effort to eradicate a cowardly conspiracy from our midst". By the Press Act of 1908 many restrictions were imposed on the absolute freedom of the Press. By the Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, wider powers were given to the judiciary to punish any one suspected of treason or subversive activities against the government after a summary trial. Bal Ganga Dhar Tilak, a leader of the Indian National Congress, who was suspected of indulging in anti-government activities, was exiled from India for six years. Simultaneously, the Government introduced reforms to win over the sympathy of the moderate sections of the people.

The Government also tried to win over the Muslims, an important minority community in the country. A deputation of the Muslims, led by Agha Khan, had a meeting with the Viceroy in 1906. They assured the Government of their loyalty and requested that their interests should be safeguarded when giving political concessions to the Indians, and some seats should be reserved for them as in the general elections they had no chance to get representation on the Councils. They also requested that there should be separate electorates for the Muslims and the Muslim representatives should only be elected by the Muslims. They congratulated the Government on the partition of Bengal. This deputation of the Muslims was very favourably inclined to the repressive policy against the Congress initiated by the Viceroy. After assuring them of his sympathy for their legitimate claims, he told them "I can only say to you that the Mahomedan community may rest assured that their political rights and interests will be safeguarded in any administrative organisation with which I am concerned". In a communication to the Secretary of State he wrote that he had won over the support of sixty-two million Muslims who could be of great help to the Government in its efforts to suppress the Congress movement.

Meanwhile, Lord Minto introduced the proposed reforms of his Council. Members of his Executive Council were not favourably

inclined to the inclusion of an Indian in the Council. Lord Kitchner was the greatest opponent of this. Even other members thought that it would mean virtually a surrender to the Congress. But Lord Minto was determined. He thought that it was a dire necessity and wrote to the Secretary of State, "If he (an Indian Member) is appointed, the attacks will, I believe, die down, and gradually disappear; if he is not appointed, we shall have a tremendous revival of agitation, in which moderates will join and with which many Anglo-Indians will sympathise". Unfortunately, the proposal was opposed not only by his Council but also by several of his predecessors, who were in England. All the same, Lord Minto pressed his point and thought it to be politically expedient in view of the great awakening in the country due to the spread of English education among the masses. Lord Morley favoured the proposal but he wanted it to emanate from his own Council. His reason was that if the Indians came to know that it was sent by the Indian Government they would consider it as the victory of the Indian National Congress. Lord Morley wrote to the Governor General, "The initiative should emanate from us; that the Government of India should not be put in the position of appearing to have its hands forced by agitation in this country, or by pressure from home that we should be the first to recognise surrounding conditions, and to place before his Majesty's Government the opinions which personal experience and a close touch with the every day life of India entitle us to hold." Both Morley and Lord Minto held the same opinion that the Indian problem could not be taken at par with the situation in England as India lagged far behind England in the development of democratic institutions. It was, however, conceded that the British Government would have to grant some more concessions to the Indians in the political set-up of the country. A Bill was introduced in the Parliament which, when proved, became known in history as the Reform Act of 1909. By this Act the Legislative Councils at the Centre and in the provinces were further enlarged. The number of their members was increased from 124 to 331. The number of elective members in each of these Councils was increased from 39 to 135. Except the Central Legislative Council there was to be a non-official majority in all legislative councils. The members of the Legislative Councils could now move resolutions on various matters of public interest. They could also discuss in detail the budget of their respective provinces and could ask supplementary questions. The Government had also taken care to make provision

for the inclusion of a proportionate number of the Muslims and other minorities in these Councils. The Government also reserved a proportionate share for the chambers of commerce ; the universities and other bodies and which existed as separate communities for the last several decades. An Indian was included in the Viceroy's Executive Council. Lord Sinhn, till then the Advocate General, was to be the first Indian Member of the Central Executive Council. The Executive Councils of Bombay and Madras were also to include an Indian Member each. The strength of these Councils was doubled. The Lieutenant Governors of various provinces were also given their own Councils. The Viceroy was empowered to create Executive Councils in provinces where these did not exist. To ensure against the inclusion of any revolutionnry elements in the Legislative Councils, the Viceroy was empowered to disqualify any member if in his opinion his inclusion in the Council would go against the interests of the State.

Both Lord Morley and Lord Minto had calculated that by their reforms they would win over the moderates and thus establish, with their co-operation, a more popular Government in the country. They were, however, soon disappointed. When the Viceroy visited Ahmedabad on the 13th of November, 1909, an attempt was made on his life and he had a very narrow escape. He tried to convince the revolutionaries that their dream of a swarajya at that early stage was fantastic and premature. He advised them to help the Government. But Gokhale and other moderates, who had acquiesced in the reforms, were also soon disappointed since by providing separate electorates for the Muslims and reservation of seats for the landed classes and other vested interests, the Government had tried to stah at the back of the Indian nationalism and to reduce the elections to a mere farce. Agitations again flared up all over the country. Lord Minto was also now determined to meet it with an iron hand and declared, "No man of honour at the head of the Government will ever compromise with revolt". He became very stiff in his attitude towards the press which had been greatly responsible for the spread of agitation in the country. He declared that the owner of every vernacular press would have to deposit a security with the Government which would stand forfeited if he printed seditious matter. In case a paper contravened the regulation for the second time the press itself would be seized by the Government. He wrote to the Secretary of State to impress upon the Home Government the necessity of keep-

ing the British press and the Parliament a little restrained in their comments on the Indian affairs. The situation in India, according to him, was explosive and any untoward remark or sympathy of the British towards the Indian movement could create a situation which would be very difficult to control.

Let us now turn our attention to the relations of the Government of India with its neighbours. In 1905 Russia, an important power in Europe, had been defeated by the Japanese. As the British had entered into an alliance with the Japanese, it was apprehended that relations between England and Russia would be estranged. And then, as the Russians had concluded an alliance with the French, the relations between the British and the French were also likely to get strained. It was not in the British interest at this moment to get isolated in this manner as they had very recently encountered a big rival in the growing power of the Germans. The British Government, therefore, planned to arrive at some rapprochement with the Russians and the French. Lord Minto wanted that the Home Government should consult the Russians in regard to the affairs of Afghanistan. Lord Curzon had invited Habib Ullah, the Afghan ruler, to India. But the latter had declined the offer as he felt that the invitation of the Viceroy was nothing short of a camouflaged threat. Immediately after his arrival, Lord Minto repeated the invitation to the Afghan ruler. Unlike the earlier letter it contained nothing which could be resented by the Afghan ruler. The latter, therefore, readily accepted the offer and reached India. He was given a reception at Agra on the 9th of January, 1907. Habib Ullah became very friendly with the Viceroy and other high officers. He thus expressed his personal feelings in one of his addresses: "Before I came to India we called ourselves friends; now I find myself in such a position that our friendship, which was like a plant before, is now like a big tree. I have gained much experience in India, and from that experience I hope to benefit my country in future. Let me say that at no time will Afghanistan pass from the friendship of India. So long as the Indian Empire desires to keep her friendship, so long will Afghanistan and British remain friends". He maintained this friendship during the first World War in the face of tempting offers from the Germans and the Turks to come to their side. The German envoy informed him that Paris would soon be captured by the German forces and in India there would be a revolution. Habib Ullah

replied that if these events took place he would join the Germans. As neither of the two events actually happened, Habib Ullah remained uncommitted to the German alliance. To the Turkish envoy, who impressed upon him the necessity of joining the flag of Islam, he replied that he would join the Turks when they would pass through his country during their march upon India. As this event also never took place the dream of the Turks to align Afghanistan with them remained unfulfilled. Many a time the tribes on the north western borders of India rose against the British. The Government apprehended that the Afghan ruler would join these rebels but he kept himself aloof and thus proved his sincerity and true friendship with the British. In fact, while returning to his country, he advised the British Government that they should move their forces as far as the Afghan borders, if they wanted to maintain peace on their borders. He thus told the British officers accompanying him during his return to his country, "Till the British frontier reaches the frontier of Afghanistan we never can have peace, so long as these tribes have not been subdued by the British, there will be trouble and intrigue." The revolts of the Zakka Khels was suppressed by the British army. Lord Minto did not feel that the frontier problem was of a very serious nature. In one of his despatches he wrote, "We could hold the country by the construction of one or two roads, or rather by the improvement of existing roads by means of tribal labour and establishment of a few advanced posts, leaving the tribes as heretofore to carry on their own tribal administration as we have done in the Swat Valley and other districts". When the Home Government was preparing a note for reaching a final settlement with the Russians over Central Asia he pressed the Home Government to include in it a clause to the effect that Afghanistan was out of the sphere of influence of Russia. He requested that the Home Government should ensure that the Russians did not extend their railways towards the south-east. He suggested that the Russians should acknowledge the claims of Government of India over the territories of Seistan and southern Persia. Unfortunately, the Home Government did not attach much importance to these suggestions of the Viceroy. He wrote in a despatch to England that "I have given you my own views in answer to your letter, but I certainly think that for reasons affecting the internal administration of India, independently of Imperial foreign policy, the Government of India should be fully consulted before any agreement is entered into with Russia." The Home

Government felt offended at the last sentence of the communication. Lord Minto, however, was not inclined to submit tamely. He genuinely felt that he was right. Therefore, he pressed his point.

The Home Government reached a settlement with the Russians whereby the latter was to be consulted in case the present regime in Afghanistan collapsed and a new Government was to be formed. When Lord Minto came to know of this he felt annoyed and wrote to the Secretary of State that consulting the Russians for effecting a change in the political status of Afghanistan was to increase their influence in that country unnecessarily. It was also against an understanding already arrived at with the Afghan ruler. He, therefore, suggested that the Home Government should remove this clause from the agreement. The Home Government appreciated the suggestion and deleted this clause. The Viceroy felt that the British Government was under an obligation to consult the Afghan ruler before making any settlement concerning his country with the Government of Russia. But he could not persuade them to agree to this. The Afghan ruler was informed only after the settlement had already been arrived at with the Russians.

The later period of Lord Minto's viceroyalty in India was not very happy. In spite of his patience and tact, Lord Morley continuously offended him by his undue interference into the affairs of India. Again and again he made the Viceroy feel as merely an agent to carry out the dictates and orders of the Secretary of State. Lord Morley was a little apprehensive about the agitation in India and had persistently written to the Viceroy that only continuous grant of concessions to the Indians could save the British rule in the country. Lord Minto did not share this disappointment of the Secretary of State, "We shall fight for the Raj as hard as we have ever fought if it comes to fighting, and we shall win as we have always done. My great object is that it shall not come to that". Lord Minto retired in 1910 and left for his country. He was succeeded by Lord Hardinge.

Lord Minto was a man of a very sound judgement and patience. He was a person of great integrity and could very quickly grasp the various problems of the State. He was a man of courage and it was a great tribute to him that he was able to complete his tenure in India patiently and successfully with a person like Lord Morley who was considered as a tyrant by his own Council. Lord

Minto was satisfied about his achievements. But he did complain of the unnecessary interference of Lord Morley. In one of his letters to his wife he wrote, "I believe I have gained my point in everything since I have been here, but it has generally been by not losing my temper when I should have been thoroughly justified in doing so, often by asserting myself in the most courteous language, and always by humouring the personality with whom I have had to deal": Lord Morley knew his own weakness and also the cooperation given to him by the Viceroy. He complimented the latter when in one of his letters to his wife he described him as an 'able, straightforward, steadfast, unselfish, and most considerate of comrades in tasks of arduous public duty.' Lord Minto did not live long after his return to England and died in 1914.

LORD HARDINGE OF PENSHURST (1910—1916)

Lord Hardinge was born at High Gate on the 20th June, 1858. He was educated at Harrow and Cambridge and his initial appointments were in the foreign service. He represented England at the courts of Turkey, France, Persia and Russia. He had also accompanied King Edward VII during his tour of various European countries. He was a permanent Under Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs before he was selected for appointment as the Viceroy of India. Early in 1910 when the question of choosing a successor to Lord Minto arose, the name of Lord Kitchner was also placed before the Cabinet in addition to that of Lord Hardinge. Lord Kitchner had returned to England after the completion of his tenure as the Commander-in-Chief in India and had been vigorously trying to get the viceroyalty of India. Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, however, was not favourably inclined towards his appointment because he felt that a general would undo all the reforms implemented under Lord Minto. Also, Lord Kitchner was not considered a fit person for the job at that time as the unrest then prevailing in India could be tackled only by a good diplomat and not by a general. Lord Hardinge was, therefore, considered as a better choice.

As the Emperor and the Empress were to visit India shortly, Lord Hardinge immediately after his arrival, made arrangements for holding a Durbar at Delhi, the historic capital of India during the last several centuries. All the important rulers of India attended

this Durbar. About sixty thousand sepoy and men of various military ranks were present on the great occasion. At this historic event Emperor George V declared the cancellation of the partition of Bengal, carried out by Lord Curzon in the face of the tough resistance and agitation of the people. However, a few districts of Assam were separated under the administrative control of a Chief Commissioner. The Emperor realised the difficulty which the administration would experience, after the two parts of the province were re-united. Therefore, a few western districts of Bihar, Orissa and Chhota Nagpur, where the people did not have Bengali as their mother tongue, were detached and a separate administration was provided for them. They were placed under a Lieutenant Governor. The re-united province of Bengal was placed under the charge of a Governor who was to be assisted by a Council like the Governors of Bombay and Madras. The change had the desired effect on the people of Bengal and the agitation, which had been started by the people about five years ago, gradually died out. The second important announcement made by the Emperor at this historic event was the shifting of the Capital from Calcutta to Delhi. This had been necessitated by the gradual expansion of the British Empire. Calcutta, which was at one time the centre of the British possessions, now came to be located in the eastern corner of the country, and, therefore, could not be an effective capital. Delhi had been the capital of the earlier rulers and was centrally located where from an effective control could be exercised over the whole of the country. Foundations of New Delhi were laid and the construction work started. The Government apprehended an agitation by the people of Bengal against this transfer of capital. However, the cancellation of the partition of Bengal was considered to be a good compensation for the transfer of the seat of the Government from Calcutta to another place in the country. On this occasion the Viceroy also announced various concessions to the people like the release of several convicts undergoing imprisonment, grant of half a month's salary to Government employees, setting apart of an amount of rupees fifty lakhs exclusively for the education of Indians and declaring Indians to be eligible for the award of Victoria Cross for gallantry or exceptional work of bravery performed in the cause of the Empire. Native rulers and several Government officials were also given titles and ranks at this function. Emperor George V was very much impressed by the reception given to him. On his return to England

he thus expressed his sentiments in a letter to the Prime Minister, "From all sources, public and private, I gather that my highest hopes have been realised. All classes, races and creeds have united in receiving us with unmistakable signs of enthusiasm and affection..... our satisfaction will be still greater if times prove that our visit has conduced to the lasting good of India and of the Empire at large."

However, behind this facade of brightness there were shadows of unrest and ill-will among the Indians due to lack of interest shown by the British in their welfare and their indifference to take them into confidence. The people in northern India were resentful at the half-hearted reforms and concessions given to them by the British Government by the Reform Act of 1909. A bomb was thrown on Lord Hardinge in Chandni Chowk of Delhi when he was on a visit there to supervise the building of the new capital. The Viceroy was wounded and it was generally believed that he would grow more indifferent towards the people after this event. However, while in his speech at the opening session of the Imperial Legislative Council he informed the Council of his determination to suppress the unruly elements in the country severely, he also added, "I assure you and the whole of India that this incident will in no sense influence my attitude. I will pursue without faltering the same policy in the future as during the past two years, and will not waver a hair's breadth from that course." The British vigilance and policy became more alert and severe in its attitude towards the revolutionaries all over the country. The movement was stated to be guided by some of the Indian revolutionaries who had been exiled due to their anti-State activities. These revolutionaries had set up their headquarters at Lahore and were engaged in terrorising the Government by making isolated attacks on the Europeans all over the country.

Lord Hardinge had declared at the Coronation Durbar at Delhi that the Government would be spending a sum of rupees fifty lakhs annually towards the education of Indians. In accordance with that declaration the Government now devoted itself toward the Primary, Secondary and Higher Education of Indians. Several schools sprang up all over the country. New Universities were opened at Patna, Banaras and Dacca. Lord Hardinge also took interest in the women's education. In this he was greatly assisted by Lady Hardinge. A Medical College, exclusively for women, was

opened at Delhi. Education got a great impetus under his guidance and some of the writers have rightly said that "He claims gratitude and admiration of the Indians for this act."

Lord Hardinge was also in favour of decentralisation. He wanted the Provincial Governments to take more responsibility in the administration of the State. Unlike Lord Curzon he wanted that the Provincial Governments should take independent action on various administrative matters. This was in the interest of efficient administration as the Government at the Centre was not fully conversant with various problems of different provinces due to the diversity of habits, customs, laws, etc., of different communities. His policy and views on the question of decentralisation are contained in one of his despatches to the Secretary of State : "A further change that I regard as very desirable is greater decentralisation and less interference from very top to the lowest rung of the administrative ladder, and the recognition that to endeavour to attain a deep uniformity in this country, where such wide variations in habits and thoughts exist, can only lead to local discontent and ultimate failure. While the Imperial Government retains and must retain the power of initiative in policy, and control, it should steadily and on broad lines delegate more and more powers to local governments to dispose of matters of merely local or secondary importance."

Lord Hardinge also contributed his share for the defence of the British in the East during the first World War in which England had to fight against a formidable rival in Germany. Germany was joined by the Sultan of Turkey. It was feared that Afghanistan and some other Muslim States also might join the Germans. The British position in the Persian Gulf was in imminent danger. The Germans won some initial successes in Europe and in the Middle East. Lord Hardinge had to despatch a strong army in Africa and the Middle East. He also had to send an army for the defence of France where the Germans had won many initial successes and the position of the British and their Allies was in imminent danger. It goes to the credit of Lord Hardinge that he succeeded in organising a strong army and gaining the cooperation of the political leaders of all shades of opinion in India during the period. About two lakhs of Indians fought in the first World War during the first two years. On the whole, India contributed an army of a million to fight for the British Empire.

The Germans and the Sultan of Turkey sent their envoys to the court of Afghanistan. Fortunately for the British, Habib Ullah, the Afghan ruler, remained sincere. To the German envoy he frankly told that he would take up the cause of the Germans if there was a general revolt in India against the British authority and the Germans succeeded in the capture of Paris, the capital of France. To the Sultan of Turkey he sent a message that he would join the green flag of Islam if the Turkish forces succeeded to pass through his country on their way to India. As none of these things actually happened, Habib Ullah remained neutral during this crisis.

During this war Indian forces played a very commendable role. Although they suffered heavy loss of lives at Kut, which was a big disaster for the Indian army, they fought faithfully for the cause of the British who could not remain indifferent. In 1917, during the course of the War it was declared that the Indians would be given due concessions for the help rendered by them to the cause of the British during the War. It was not obligatory on the part of Indian army to fight a war for the British Government in which no Indian interests were involved. Lord Hardinge was also not expected to manage the great war in the Middle East. It is really a tribute for both the Indian army and the Viceroy that they went beyond their limits of duty to save the British interests in the East. The Indians expected that for all their cooperation and loyalty during the War they would be given self-government or home rule as had been given to the people of Canada, Australia or Ireland by the British Government. But unfortunately, neither the British Government at home nor Lord Hardinge considered India ripe for these concessions. Lord Hardinge, thus expressed his sentiments in this regard, "I do not wish for a moment to discountenance self-government for India as a national ideal. It is a perfectly legitimate aspiration and has the warm sympathy of all moderate men. But in the present position of India it is not idealism that is needed, but practical politics and practical solutions of questions arising out of the social and political conditions in this country. We should all look at facts squarely in the face, and do our utmost to grapple with realities." When after the War the British Government came forward with the reforms of 1919, which fell much short of the expectations of the Indians, the latter felt disappointed and an all-India agitation against the British Government broke out.

Lord Hardinge returned to England in 1916. During the six years of his viceroyalty he upgraded Bengal from a province under the charge of a Lieutenant Governor into a full-fledged presidency with a Governor-in-Council at the helm of affairs. He also created the posts of Lieutenant Governors-in Council for the provinces of Bihar and Orissa. High Courts were established in the provinces of Bihar and Orissa while another was promised to the province of Punjab. Non-official members were to have a majority in the Legislative Councils of the Central Provinces and Assam while the elected members were to have a majority in the provinces of Bihar and Orissa.

—:o:—

ANGLO-AFGHAN RELATIONS

It was from Napoleon that the Russians got their inspiration for the extension of their sway over Central Asia and the Middle East countries. The history of the nineteenth century is a long record of the advance of Russian influence in the East. This policy of Russia posed a constant threat to the eastern possessions of the British and the British Government in India remained busy in increasing its influence at the courts of Punjab, Afghanistan and Persia. The First Afghan War was a direct result of this Russophobia in India. The ruler of Afghanistan was replaced with a puppet of their own by the British in order to have a better control over the foreign policy of Afghanistan. The Afghans resented this high-handed policy of the British. They declared a Jihad against them, routed them and forced them to withdraw from their country unconditionally after suffering heavy losses. Dost Mohammed was restored to his possessions.

The British annexed the Punjab in 1849 and the North Western boundary of their Empire now ran with that of Afghanistan. Meanwhile the Russians were steadily sneaking nearer to Afghanistan. In 1855 the British for the first time came up against the Russian danger in Herat through the Persians. The latter had concluded an alliance with the Russians and had simultaneously recaptured Herat from the Afghans, murdering Yusuf Khan, the Afghan governor of the province. They even threatened to attack the province of Kandhar. Dost Mohammed solicited the help of the British. A Treaty was concluded with the Amir in 1855 by which the British undertook to help the Amir with an annual subsidy of a lakh of rupees which was to be utilised by the latter for the maintenance of a standing army. The Persians were asked to vacate their aggression of Herat. When the Persians refused to withdraw, an army was sent under Outram in the beginning of 1857 to the Persian Gulf. The appearance of the British army made the Persians realise the gravity of the situation. They quietly withdrew from Herat, which was recaptured by Dost Mohammed, who felt much grateful to the British. In Central Asia, the Khan of Khokand had requested the British Government for assistance against the aggressive designs of the Russians. The British

Government did not help the Khan but it served to make them more alert. They concluded an agreement with the ruler of Kalat and increased their hold on the Bolan Pass. They also got an undertaking from the Khan that in the case of an emergency the British could enter the territories of Kalat. During the rising of 1857 the British apprehended an attack from Afghanistan. Dost Mohammed was pressed by many of his chiefs and his favourite son, Sher Ali, to lead an attack on India to avenge the excesses of the British in Afghanistan but the Amir preferred the sane and wise advice of his third son, Aazam Khan, to avoid a conflict with the British. This friendliness of the Afghan ruler during a period of crisis was appreciated by the British Government in India.

Jacob, who was considered to be an expert on the frontier affairs, suggested the occupation of Quetta by the British Government. He wanted the British Government not to pick up a quarrel with Russia over Khiva. Rather, he wanted that they should have a stronger control over Afghanistan and passes leading to that country to keep the British communications safe. Lord Canning did not agree to this suggestion as it would have created a suspicion in the minds of the Afghans and the Baluchis about the intentions of the British.

Dost Mohammed died in 1863, nominating Sher Ali as his successor to the Afghan throne. There was no opposition to his authority in the beginning. Afzal and Aazam, who were his chief rivals and were the governors of the strategic provinces of Herat and Kurram respectively, declared in his favour. Afzal, who was the bravest of the sixteen sons of Dost Mohammed and who, but for his weak birth right, had undisputedly a better claim to the throne than all others, was the first to throw off his allegiance and declared his independence. Sher Ali advanced with an army to meet him. Afzal was now joined by Aazam, who also declared in favour of Afzal. A drawn battle was fought at Bajgah. A reconciliation was effected and the two brothers agreed to respect each other's claims. Sher Ali, however, did not remain loyal to his commitment. He arrested Afzal and took him as a prisoner to Kabul. Abdur Rehman, the eldest son of Afzal, escaped to Bukhara. Aazam fled to India where the British Government granted him a maintenance allowance. Lord Lawrence, who was British Viceroy in India at that time, was in favour of a non-interference policy in Afghanistan. He had seen service in the Punjab for several years and was fully conversant with the Afghan affairs. He immediately acknowledged Sher Ali as the ruler of Afghanistan.

Meanwhile Abdur Rehman secured the support of the chief of Badakshan. He was also joined by Aazam. Both of them advanced upon Balkh and captured it. There was also a revolt against the authority of Sher Ali by his younger brother, Amin Khan, the then chief of Kandhar. In the struggle which ensued, Amin Khan was defeated. Sher Ali lost his favourite son in this struggle. Abdur Rehman and Aazam captured Ghazni and Kabul. Sher Ali advanced to meet them at Sheikhabad. In the engagement, fought on the 10th of May, 1866, Sher Ali was defeated. He fled back to Kandhar. Abdur Rehman declared his father Afzal as the ruler of Kabul. Lord Lawrence in turn acknowledged Afzal as the ruler of Kabul and Sher Ali as the ruler of Kandhar and Herat. He strictly followed the policy of non-interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. He wanted to maintain friendly relations with its *de facto* ruler who-so-ever he might be. To Afzal he thus wrote, "My friend I the relations of this Government are with the actual rulers of Afghanistan.....if your Highness is able to consolidate your Highness's power in Cabul and is sincerely desirous of being a friend and ally of the British Government, I shall be ready to accept your Highness as such ; but I cannot break the existing engagements with Ameer Sher Ali Khan, and I must continue to treat him as the ruler of that portion of Afghanistan over which he retains control."

Unfortunately, after his accession Afzal took no interest in the affairs of the State, Aazam, who ruled in the name of his brother Afzal, was a tyrant and, therefore, the people became dissatisfied with him. This gave Sher Ali a chance to advance from Kandhar over Kabul. He was, however, defeated by the combined forces of Abdur Rehman and Aazam and was forced to give up even the province of Kandhar. Afzal thus became the ruler of both Kabul and Kandhar. Lord Lawrence now acknowledged him as the ruler of both the provinces. But he still acknowledged Sher Ali as the ruler of Herat.

There were many people in India who did not like this pacific and opportunistic policy of Lord Lawrence. They considered it impolitic and wanted him to take up the cause of one particular claimant in the civil war, help him to success, strengthen his government in Afghanistan and gain control over his foreign affairs. Lord Lawrence, however, did not agree with these critics. He thought that the best guarantee for the security of the British interests lay in

a strong frontier and in a strong government within the country. He wanted the British Government at home to try to come to an understanding with the Russians direct. However, he was always on the watch and took a keen interest in the day to day developments in Central Asia and on the borders of Afghanistan. He argued that by following a forward policy the British Government would weaken its position because with the advance of the British forces beyond Indus, the contact with the bases in India would be lost and thus sending of reinforcements in a period of emergency would be difficult. This would mean removing obstacles in the way of an invader from outside in an attack over the British possessions in India. Such a policy would require maintenance of a large army far away from its base, which would be very expensive. This would estrange the Afghans, tribal chiefs and the chiefs of Baluchistan and thus deprive the British Government of the support of these people in the case of an aggression from outside. Thus, such a policy, according to Lord Lawrence, was not in the interest of the British Government. The British Government had earlier advanced in Afghanistan but had to retrace its steps after suffering heavy losses both in terms of men and material. The Russians were no doubt a great danger to the British position in India and their growing influence in Bukhara, Khiva and Khokand and their march towards Merv were really very serious events but the best course, according to Lord Lawrence, was the strengthening of the British borders in India and a policy of non-interference in the affairs of Afghanistan.

Different Afghan princes fighting for the throne of Afghanistan had approached Lord Lawrence for help one after the other. He frankly told every one of them that under no circumstances a British army would advance into their country to settle their internal disputes. He told them that the British Government would give its moral support to every *de facto* ruler of Afghanistan. The British Government will also help him with money and material but at their own discretion. The British Government would not make any commitments with any of the rival princes and would never think of depriving the Afghans of their independence. He, however, frankly informed the Afghans that the British Government would never tolerate the interference of a third power, rival to the British Government, in Afghanistan and in the case of an unprovoked aggression from outside on Afghanistan the British Government would use all its resources to get the aggression vacated.

The Civil war in Afghanistan went on. Faiz Mohammed, the Governor of Balkh, revolted against the authority of Kabul and defeated an army sent against him by Afzal. Meanwhile, Afzal died after a rule of sixteen months and was succeeded by his younger brother Aazam. Sher Ali joined hands with Faiz Mohammed and advanced upon Kabul. In the engagement which took place on the 13th of September, 1867, Sher Ali was defeated and he again fled to Herat. Yaqub Khan, the eldest son of Sher Ali, captured Kandhar. Sher Ali also returned to the scene. Both of them now advanced upon Ghazni and captured it. Kabul was captured on the 22nd of August and after the defeat of Aazam, Sher Ali again became the ruler of Kabul, Kandhar and Herat on the 11th of September 1868. Lord Lawrence congratulated him on his success and sent him a present of six lakhs of rupees and thirty five thousand stands of arms.

Lord Mayo, who succeeded Lord Lawrence, followed the latter's policy of limiting the British influence only upto the borders of the Empire and non-interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. This policy was criticised even by the Afghans who declared the British as the worshippers of the rising sun. Sher Ali had remarked once. "The British look to nothing but their own interest and bide their time." Sher Ali had anxiously wanted to stabilize his position. He accepted an invitation of the Viceroy. The latter gave a very rousing reception to Sher Ali at Ambala. At the meeting he told the Viceroy frankly that he wanted to conclude a definite alliance. He exhorted the British Government to accept his request and to give him an undertaking that they would support him and his children to the throne of Afghanistan; that they would not support any other rival claimant against his dynasty; that they would give him a fixed help in money and material every year; that they would defend him against any unprovoked foreign aggression and that they would acknowledge his favourite child Abdulla Jan as his successor. Lord Mayo gave a very patient hearing to him but refused to make any commitment. He told him that the British Government would give him all its moral support and would look with disfavour the rise of any rival claimant in Afghanistan. The Government would not commit to any definite assistance. As and when the Amir was in need of it, the necessary assistance to strengthen his hold over Afghanistan and to help him tide over his economic difficulties would be given. However, the quantum of the help and the occasion when it would be given would rest with the British Government. In his report to the

Home Government, Lord Mayo stated that Sher Ali had returned satisfied. However, in reality Sher Ali was not very happy with the outcome of the conference. He had returned disappointed. However, the affairs in Afghanistan remained peaceful during the viceroyalty of Lord Mayo.

Lord Northbrook, who succeeded Lord Mayo, declared himself in favour of the policy followed by his predecessors. The Russians had been gradually extending their sway over Central Asia. They had already captured Khokand, Samarkand and were now encroaching upon Bukhara. They captured Khiva in 1873. There was a clamour for an active frontier policy. Many experienced officers suggested that the British Government should immediately extend its hold over Baluchistan and Kabul. Sir Bartle Frere, who was considered an authority on the frontier problems suggested that the British Government should keep its agents in Kabul, Kandhar and Herat, and should establish a post at Quetta. These agents would keep the British Government in India acquainted with the day-to-day developments on the borders of Afghanistan. Sir Bartle Frere also suggested that the Afghan Government should be acquainted with the danger on their borders and they should be asked to follow the advice of the British in regard to their foreign policy. Simultaneously to avoid a misunderstanding with the Afghans, they should be clearly informed that the British Government had no intention of interfering in their internal affairs. These recommendations of Sir Bartle Frere, though not implemented immediately, proved to be the blueprint of the later British policy in Afghanistan.

Lord Northbrook wanted to befriend the ruler of Afghanistan and to impress upon him the fact that he had no intention of revising the policy followed by his predecessors. Sher Ali had somehow been estranged with the British due to their arbitration award over the Seistan border. He was also unhappy over their non-committal and indifferent attitude. Lord Northbrook tried to pacify the Amir by explaining that as and when there would be an unprovoked attack on Afghanistan by a foreign power, the British Government would use its resources to repel the aggressor. He also decided to pay him an amount of Rupees ten lakhs as the compensation for the losses suffered by the Amir as a result of the Seistan Award. Sher Ali, however, did not feel satisfied and did not accept the compensation. Gladstone, the Liberal Prime Minister in England, had in the meantime, approached the Russian Government and an understanding was

reached between the two Governments in 1873 by which the Russians acknowledged the British interests in Afghanistan.

With the accession to power of the Conservative party in England the British policy in Afghanistan underwent a change. Lord Salisbury, who became the next Secretary of State for India, was in favour of a forward policy. He desired that the British influence in Afghanistan should be extended and the Amir be forced to accept a British Resident at his court. In exchange, the Amir was to be promised British protection against any internal rising or foreign aggression. Lord Northbrook, however, did not feel that there was any possibility of a danger from Russia. He rightly argued that the Afghans would never like the presence of a British Resident at Kabul. He explained to the Secretary of State that he did not feel the necessity of imposing a British resident upon the Amir when the latter himself was keeping the British Government acquainted with the developments in his country. Lord Salisbury, however, insisted that a mission should be sent to Afghanistan. Lord Northbrook resigned in protest.

Lord Lytton came to India determined to change the policy of his predecessors and to extend the British influence in Afghanistan. He seriously wanted to find a permanent solution of the problem of the turbulent frontier tribes who had been a constant head-ache to Governments of Punjab and Sind. In the beginning the Government did not like to follow a very strong policy towards these semi-civilized tribesmen. They closed their own borders but allowed these people to come to the Punjab and Sind for trade. Unfortunately, they proved to be very troublesome. The two Governments only undertook punitive expeditions against such tribes as created trouble. But, it was soon felt that this policy was not very effective. The Indian Government was spending a lot on the maintenance of law and order on its borders but there was no peace. Sandeman, who had an intimate knowledge of this area, suggested a line of action which is known as the Sandeman System. He recommended non-interference in their internal administration, leaving them to settle their mutual quarrels through their tribal Jirgas. However, he desired that the chief of each tribe should be paid a fixed allowance for the maintenance of law and order in his territories. But, Lord Lytton was seriously thinking of extending the British boundaries beyond some of these tribal lands so as to have a direct approach to the Afghan territories. In 1877 he annexed Quetta and converted it into a

military post for keeping a watch over the Bolan pass and Kandhar. Lord Canning and Lord Lawrence had refrained from taking this bold step as it would definitely lead to estrangement of relations with Afghanistan. Lord Lytton, on the other hand, did not care for the sentiments of the Afghans. But, as was expected, his action resulted in the instigation of the tribesmen who rose in an open revolt. The first to rise were the Mahsuds. The Waziris next revolted under Mullah Powindah and gave the British Government many anxious moments.

Unlike his predecessors, Lord Lytton wanted to reduce Afghanistan into a subordinate state so that it could be utilised for counter-acting the advance of the Russians. The Amir was asked to receive a mission to which he was reluctant. He sent Atta Mohammad Khan, the British Agent at his court, to Simla, to receive the message of the British Viceroy on his behalf. Instead of employing persuasive methods to impress upon the Amir the growing danger of Russia and the need for a permanent and clear alliance with the British Government, Lord Lytton used very offensive language and threats. This attitude of the Viceroy greatly disturbed Sher Ali who sent Nur Mohammad Shah as his envoy to Peshawar to explore the possibility of concluding an alliance with the British Government. Unfortunately, Lord Lytton was not agreeable to an alliance but was interested only to secure utter humiliation of the Amir and the total surrender of his foreign policy. The negotiations were still going on when Nur Mohammad Shah died. The Amir wanted to send another agent, but before he could do so, Lord Lytton declared the conference as closed and sent a fabricated report about the hostile attitude of the Amir and of his leanings towards Russia to England. Meanwhile, relations between England and Russia were estranged over the Balkan question. The overbearing attitude of Disraeli towards the Russians forced the latter to retaliate by sending a mission to the court of Afghanistan to negotiate an alliance against the British Government. The Amir had already been informed by Lord Lytton that the British were not responsible for his protection and that they did not want to have any connections with him. In these circumstances, he could not refuse to receive the Russian mission. Meanwhile, an amicable settlement was reached between the Russians and the British and the Russian mission was instructed not to go beyond the formalities of a complimentary visit. But now Lord Lytton was determined to send a mission to the court of Amir. He

felt that the Amir could not refuse to receive a British mission when he had already admitted one from Russia. At this time, the Afghan Government was in a state of mourning due to the death of Prince Abdulla Jan. The Russian envoy had not yet departed from Kabul due to his illness. The Amir felt that it was not an opportune moment for him to receive the British mission and wanted to postpone it for some time. Sir Neville Chamberlain, who led the British Mission, was accordingly stopped near the Khyber Pass and courteously, but resolutely, asked to return. This refusal of entry to the British Mission had its repercussions both in England and in India. The British felt insulted and there was a cry for revenge against the Amir. The Mission had been sent by Lord Lytton on his own authority. He had not taken the approval of the Home Government. But, in the circumstances, Lord Disraeli and Lord Salisbury had no alternative but to support him in sending an army to avenge the insult. Lord Lawrence, who had a thorough knowledge of the Indian Affairs, still protested against this direct action. He tried to see the Prime Minister to persuade him to refrain from marching an army into Afghanistan but failed. His letter, published in the Times of the 27th September 1898, very correctly forecast the result of such an aggressive policy. In that he wrote: "There will be no real dishonour in coming to terms with him; whereas, by pressing on him our own policy, we may incur most serious difficulties and even disasters."

Lord Lytton sent an ultimatum to the Amir asking him to surrender unconditionally to the British the management of his foreign policy. Without receiving a reply he moved his forces into Afghanistan from Bolan, Kurram and Khyber. He was determined to extend the British sway over the tribal lands and to gain an effective control over the foreign policy of Afghanistan. Sher Ali did not consider himself strong enough to meet the British challenge. Therefore, he fled to Russian Turkistan, where he died a few months later. The British opened correspondence with Yaqub Khan, the eldest son of Sher Ali, who, by the treaty of Gandamak, agreed to the British control over his foreign policy, surrendered the territories of Sibi, Pishin and Kurram and agreed to the maintenance of a British Resident at his court. The British Government undertook to pay a subsidy of Rupees six lakhs a year to him in return for a complete control over his foreign policy and the administration of the territories of Kurram, Pishin and Sibi. Lord Lytton was jubilant

as the Treaty of Gandamak meant a grand success for his foreign policy. It gave a scientific frontier to the British from where they could easily march upon Kabul. This also gave them effective control over the tribal lands.

However, expectations of Lord Lytton proved illusory when only a few months later Cavagnari, the British Resident, was murdered by the Afghans. Immediately, there was a cry for a revenge. The British forces advanced and captured Kandhar. Yaqub Khan was taken a prisoner and forced to abdicate. General Roberts, who commanded the British army, declared that he was going to avenge the murder of the British Resident. Lord Lytton had instructed him not to treat the Amir very harshly. He had given up the idea of forcing a British Resident upon the Afghans. But General Roberts did not share the views of Lord Lytton. He held Yaqub Khan to be responsible for the murder although the enquiry held against him proved that he had tried his best to save the British Resident and that twice he had tried to go personally to the place of occurrence to quell the disturbance but had been dissuaded by his counsellors, who considered his own life in danger if he had gone to the residency. Lord Lytton had desired that Yaqub Khan should be restored if nothing definite could be found against him. This was not done and he was sent to India as a prisoner. Now there was no competent prince in Afghanistan who could control the restive Afghans. His disappearance from the scene worsened the situation and General Roberts himself wrote in one of his despatches that the situation all over the country was serious with the Afghans having risen against the British authority. Lord Lytton knew that till the Afghans were completely crushed, there was no possibility of restoration of the British influence in Afghanistan. Therefore, he recommended to the Home Government a permanent occupation of Kandhar and the appointment of Wali Mohammad Shah, who was willing to act as a puppet of the British, as the ruler of Kabul. The Home Government, however, did not agree to this proposal. They asked General Roberts only to impress upon the Afghans the supremacy of the British Government. This could be done either by placing a weak ruler on the throne of Kabul, which had been rejected by the Home Government, or by dividing the country into chiefdoms. Lord Lytton, therefore, now recommended that Afghanistan should be parcelled into three chiefdoms at Kabul, Kandhar and Herat. These three chiefs were to be responsible to the British Government for their

foreign policy. The proposal of taking over the Herat by the British Government was also considered at one time but given up.

The whole Afghanistan rose up in arms against the British and declared a jihad under Mullah Mushak-i-Alam. It was now planned to appoint Wail Mohammad Shah as the ruler of Kabul and Sher Ali as the ruler of Kandhar. The Afghans were informed that there was no possibility of the restoration of Yaqub Khan. Since the Afghans were not satisfied with either of the two nominees, there could be no possibility of a restoration of peace in the country.

Abdur Rehman, who was living in the Russian Turkistan as a pensioner of Russia, was on the look out for an opportunity for regaining the kingdom of his ancestors. When he found the whole of Afghanistan in revolt and the British helpless in locating a suitable man who could restore law and order, he appeared in Ghor. He had all the qualities necessary in a ruler to restore law and order to the country. By his victories against Sher Ali during the period of his father, he had earned a great name among the Afghans. He was hailed as the man of the hour. An immediate recognition of his title to the throne was obtained from the Home Government. Griffin was despatched to Kabul to open negotiations with him. Abdur Rehman wrote to Griffin, "By granting assistance and sympathy to the people of Afghanistan, you will permanently establish them under the honourable protection of the two powers. This would redound to the credit of both, and would give peace to Afghanistan, and comfort and quiet to God's people." The British were apprehensive of Abdur Rehman's sincerity as he had stayed under Russian influence for several years and from his secret correspondence with the Chiefs of various tribes, it appeared that he was inclined to maintain good relations both with England and Russia. But the misunderstanding was removed by the frankness of Abdur Rehman. The British agent told him that they did not want to keep a resident or to have any direct or indirect influence at his court at Kabul. However, he could not maintain relations with any foreign power other than the British. On these terms Abdur Rehman agreed to accept the Government of Kabul with the reservation that he would ratify the agreement only after he had discussed it with various Afghan chiefs.

Meanwhile, there was a change of Government in England and Lord Lytton was replaced by Lord Ripon. The latter was not in favour of a forward policy. He also did not like to maintain a

British army at Kandhar or to impose such conditions on the new Afghan ruler as would weaken his position in the country and make it difficult for him to establish a popular government. Before his departure, Lord Lytton had left a note for his successor, stressing the desirability of maintaining British control over Kandhar and Kurram, so that there could be no danger from Russia. Lord Ripon, however, did not see eye to eye with this policy. He was in favour of having one strong Government in Afghanistan under Abdur Rehman instead of several chiefdoms. But Lord Lytton had already got an approval of the Home Government to the accession of Sher Ali at Kandhar.

Circumstances, however, soon helped Lord Ripon to change the policy of his predecessor. Ayub Khan, the younger son of Sher Ali, attacked Kandhar, defeated a British army and Sher Ali at Maiwand and captured Kandhar. However, General Roberts recaptured Kandhar soon thereafter. The British Government was not now obliged to restore Kandhar to Sher Ali, who himself was not keen to stay on in Kandhar. He was, therefore, pensioned off and sent to Karachi. The British army was withdrawn, thus making it possible for Abdur Rehman to re-establish himself at Kabul not apparently as a puppet of the British Government, but as a real ruler in his own right. A few British officers left in Kabul also returned to India, giving a clear field to Abdur Rehman. Kandhar was also added to his possessions.

Ayub Khan once again appeared with an army and recaptured Kandhar. It was a very critical moment for the British Government. Ayub Khan's success in ousting Abdur Rehman would have meant that the British Government must resume the war against the Afghan Government. However, the situation was saved as Abdur Rehman defeated Ayub Khan and not only captured Kandhar but also recovered Herat. With the establishment of a strong government over the three regions of Kabul, Kandhar and Herat under Abdur Rehman Khan, who was very friendly to the British Government, the Afghanistan tangle was solved satisfactorily. Now they had no fear of the Russian aggression which would be definitely resisted in Afghanistan before it could in any way affect the Indian territories. The Government in England wanted to give free reins to Abdur Rehman. It suggested the restoration of the territories of Pishin, Sibi and Kurram to him. Lord Ripon, however, did not agree to this proposal as with

these advanced bases the British could easily control the passes leading to India and could also keep themselves acquainted with the developments in Kandhar, Kabul and Herat. Abdur Rehman was strengthened by assistance in the form of money and material. He was, however, frankly informed that the British Government would never tolerate the interference of any third power in Afghanistan. Indirectly, Lord Ripon also promised him assistance against any unprovoked aggression on his territory. Abdur Rehman agreed to this proposal and later requested for the posting of a British agent who should be an Indian.

An annual subsidy of Rupees twelve lakhs, to be paid to Abdur Rehman in twelve equal monthly instalments for the defence of his country and the maintenance of a standing army, was also agreed upon. Later on, Abdur Rehman requested for pecuniary assistance of a crore of rupees. Lord Ripon, however, paid him another ten lakhs and informed him that that was a small gift to help him in the strengthening of his Government.

If Lord Ripon was not in favour of a forward policy in Afghanistan he was not altogether ignorant of the developments in Central Asia. He requested the Home Government to come to an understanding with the Russian Government in regard to their continuing advance towards the south and the northern boundary of Afghanistan.

Abdur Rehman strengthened his position at Kabul and never forgot the friendship of Lord Ripon, who had tried his utmost to strengthen his hands without creating any complications for him. Lord Ripon held that treaty with the Russians could remove, once for all, the anxiety of the British in the north. He did not enter into any binding contract with the Amir although he lavishly helped him with money and material. The Amir became so confident of his position and of the British protection that he began to campaign in the north for the restoration of his influence in the area which had long ago become independent under various chiefs and had avoided making payment of tribute to him. The Russians, in the meantime, had captured Merv. Lord Ripon became anxious. He apprehended a clash between the Russians and the Afghans as both were busy in extending their boundaries. His efforts led to the appointment of a commission for the demarcation of the boundary between the two countries. At this juncture Lord Ripon returned to England, handing over the charge of the Government to Lord Dufferin.

The policy of Lord Ripon although analogous to that of Lord Lytton except with regard to the maintenance of a Resident at Kabul, was quite successful. This very policy had earlier been recommended by Bartle Frere. It was neither a forward nor a stationery policy. He had adopted the middle path. He helped the Amir to establish a strong government in Afghanistan, thereby proving that a strong government in that country under a ruler friendly to the British was far more effective and economical than the partition of the country under several chiefs. He had proved the futility of the maintenance of British control over Kandhar and Herat which greatly increased the British responsibility.

The Commission appointed to draw the boundary line between Afghanistan and Russia consisted of a representative each of the British and the Russian Governments. During the process of demarcation both the Russians and the Afghans were extending and consolidating their hold on more and more territories in order to present the Commission with a *fait accompli*. At that time the last Russian post was at Zulfiqar pass while the Afghans had occupied Panjdeh. There was a great tension between the two. The British Commissioner suggested to the Home Government that the Afghan ruler be advised not to increase the number of his forces at Panjdeh as it would create a crisis and might even lead to an open rupture between the Russians and the Afghans. Never before had the Afghans advanced so much in the North. Equally dubious was the position of the Russians, who, in 1873, had accepted River Oxus as their boundary in the South. Neither of the two governments gave a serious thought to the demarcation of a boundary between their possessions. Between the countries lay the independent region of the Andkhuri Turkomans which both Afghanistan and Russia now were over-running.

Sir Peter Lumsden, the British Commissioner, failed to maintain peace between the two. An engagement took place wherein the Afghans were defeated and the Russians captured Panjdeh. While this engagement was being fought Abdur Rahman was on a State visit to India and was enjoying the hospitality of Lord Dufferin at Rawalpindi. He did not attach any importance to the incident and even showed his indifference, stating that it was difficult for the Afghans to maintain their hold on Panjdeh. However, on his arrival in Afghanistan he gave vent to his bitter feelings against the British

Commissioner, whom he held responsible for this disaster. There was a great hue and cry in England and Gladstone was obliged to declare a war. An expenditure of one crore and ten lakhs sterling was sanctioned for it. However, a better sense prevailed on the parties and the dispute over Panjdeh was submitted for arbitration. England lost the case and Panjdeh became a part of the Russian territory. This was humiliating for the British. Gladstone was held responsible for this loss of prestige. A dispassionate study of the problem, however, would reveal that the Afghans never enjoyed control over Panjdeh which was always autonomous. The Commission awarded the Zulfikar post to the Afghans. The Boundary line between Russia and Afghanistan was drawn on the 22nd of July, 1887 and the danger of a war finally averted. The Amir still suspected the Russian designs and requested the British Viceroy in India for an authenticated copy of the boundary-line agreement, duly, signed by the two Governments.

There was no reasonable ground to criticise Gladstone for the loss of Panjdeh. The Russian advance in Central Asia was more a mission of enlightening the people of those semi civilised regions with the culture and civilisation of Europe, than an imperial advance like the British mission in the East. The British, therefore, had no right to protest against the Russian advance in those regions which had not yet been visited by any European nation. Dr. D.K. Ghose writes, "Russia had a civilising mission in Central Asia, much as Britain had one in the East, and in so far as Russian aggression was commensurate with the accepted principles of European diplomacy, England could not legitimately protest against it."

INDIAN NATIONALISM

BACK-GROUND

THE pre-British India was a country consisting of a large number of small, self-contained, democratic, rural republics, with their own self-sufficient economic and administrative systems. Their link with the Central Government whenever one existed was very loose and consisted only in the submission of a certain percentage of the village produce as land revenue. In all other aspects the life in the village was unaffected by any change of Government at the Centre. Dynasties rose and fell but the villages continued to plod along their beaten track as dis-interested units. The kings also did not interfere in the working of these rural democracies.

The self-sufficient village had an all-powerful panchayat as its administrative body. The agriculture was carried on by means of the primitive plough, drawn by a pair of bullocks. After paying a fixed percentage of the village produce as land revenue to the Central Government, the balance was consumed in the village itself. Village artisans, such as the smith, the carpenter, the potter, the weaver, the cobbler, the washerman, the oilman and the barber, etc., also received a share of the produce as payment towards their services to the community.

A very rigid caste system was prevalent in these villages. People belonging to a particular profession had to carry on with it from one generation to the other without even thinking of changing it. In other words, the occupations were hereditary and could not be changed. In fact, the whole life in a village community was static at the level of civilisation dating back to the ingress of Aryans into India. The occasions when the people move outside their village, were related only to marriage or pilgrimages. The result was that there were no proper means of communications as they were not needed. The old bullock-cart served the purpose well. There was nothing to break the insularity of these village republics.

Attempts were certainly made by some progressive monarchs like Asoka, Samudragupta, Chandragupta, Vikramaditya and later in

the day, Akbar the Great to weld the whole country into one unit but their efforts were directed only to bringing all the dis-united and numerous feudal States, quarrelling among themselves, under one hegemony and did not penetrate into the closed systems of the villages. The result was that the unity of the country, effected by them, was only superficial and skin-deep. It therefore, could not last and as soon as their strong hand was lifted the centrifugal forces broke the whole fabric erected by them. The country remained as un-national as ever.

The life in such an atmosphere was bound to narrow the outlook of the people and to limit their vision only upto the vicinity of their village. They had of necessity to have the interests of their village at heart and could not have looked beyond. This kind of consciousness was not a fertile ground for the growth of the feeling of nationalism. In fact, India as a united nation having a common economy, a central administrative system and common sympathies was non-existent before the coming of the British.

Over 85% of the population of the country lived in villages. Therefore, the urban society of the pre-British days mainly concentrated in a few towns, was comprised of just about 15% of the people. There were three kinds of towns i.e., those of religious, political and commercial importance. These towns were either seats of Government, or chief cantonments, or pilgrimage places or trade centres. As opposed to the ignorant, illiterate and superstitious people of the villages, the urban population consisted of princes, nobles, rich merchants, wealthy citizens, artists like sculptors, painters, poets, etc., and people working in various industries, located at these places, to the diverse and complex needs of the high social strata.

It could, therefore, be expected that the towns contained the intelligentsia and the elite of the society of those times. All the cultural activities of the period were concentrated in these towns. The kings, the princes, the nobles and the affluent members of the urban society patronised men of arts and letters and various works of art which bore testimony to the high level of perfection achieved by the Indian mind and intellect were produced in the pre-British period. However, even the urban population which had the advantages of superior knowledge and better opportunities, could not rise above the levels of clan and party sympathies. There were king's courts, assemblies of learned men and other gatherings of the people who

could have given a lead to the general public but at these meetings only religious or philosophical discourses were held. There was no attempt at forging the conception of a single nation or development of a common factor. Rather, the persons belonging to opposite parties or holding opposing views only disputed one another's points of view, trying to uphold their own superiority over the others, asserting the merits of one's own religion by deriding the other faiths. The idea of a national unity or consciousness could not have been fostered in this kind of atmosphere.

The most unsurmountable hurdle which has always stood in the way of the forging of national unity in India is the multiplicity of religious faiths professed by her masses. They have struggled to shake off the shackles of this narrow and sectarian outlook but they have never been able to rise above this. And within the main religion too the vision of people has been further limited by the innumerable divisions into castes, sub-castes and sects, which have further divided even those who believe in the same religion.

In these circumstances, there could not be any common economic, social and political consciousness which could have influenced and exercised the minds of everyone. For this reason there could not be any national culture in the pre-British India. Therefore, in spite of the fact that in arts, letters, medicine, sciences, handicrafts and trade and commerce India made tremendous progress in pre-British period, there was no national consciousness among her people at that time. It was only when the British attacked and destroyed the insularity of the village republics, gave the country a uniform legal system, introduced modern education, improved the means of communications by establishment of railways and roads, and by doing so brought about many other drastic changes in the administrative and economic systems then prevailing in India that the Indians could think in terms of a country and develop a sense of nationalism. It is true that the main aim of the British was not to generate this spirit among the people of this country : they did all this and introduced various reforms in order only to facilitate and strengthen their own control over the country, which was providing a fruitful ground for the investment of the surplus capital generated in Britain due to the Industrial Revolution in that country. But this national consciousness developed as a by-product in spite of the wishes of the British to the contrary. It is proposed to discuss the development of this spirit as a result of vario-

us factors, both indigcnous and foreign, in the pages which follow.

PHYSICAL BARRIERS TO NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS :

It has been studied before how the society of the pre-British India was bound down to its narrow and sectarian outlook mainly because of certain limitations and shortcomings. The British, though working for their own ends, systematically removed those limitations and thereby destroyed the isolation of the Indian society.

The Indian economy has always been predominantly agrarian in character. It was, therefore, in the field of agriculture that the changes effected by the British had far-reaching consequences. The Permanent Land Settlement for Bengal, Bihar and Orissa was introduced by Lord Cornwallis, after a long controversy by primarily for reasons of administrative convenience. But it created landlords out of those persons who had so far been responsible only for the collection of land revenue. They owned land as their private property for the first time in the history of this country by the courtesy of the British. Therefore, they, as a class, were the chief supporters of the alien rule. This system was later on introduced in a much modified and varied form in other parts of the country which came under the British sway. One of these systems was called the Ryotwari system under which instead of Zamindar becoming the landlord, the cultivator was given the proprietary rights over the land tilled by him.

This transformation of land from an asset of the community into private property led to the commercialisation of agriculture. The land could be sold, purchased or mortgaged by the landlord at his will. He was no longer responsible to the village community for his actions. After paying land revenue to the Government, he could keep the balance as his share and could pay other peasants and labourers working on his land as his servants. He was no longer dictated by the needs and customs of the community to grow certain crops needed by the village. He could experiment with new crops which could bring him more money in the market. And when the Government slowly took over the functions of the village panchayats in the matter of administration of law and order, the whole village economy was disrupted and revolutionised. It came to be linked up with the whole national economy. After this change, the agricultural problems and interests of a village could not remain confined to its narrow boundar-

ies but had of necessity to be viewed in their broader sense as pertaining to the whole national economy.

The urban handicraft industry also did not fare any better. In fact, in a way, it suffered the most : it just vanished almost from the entire country. The avalanche of the British conquest swept away the kingdoms, the feudatory states and the petty chieftnships like so much flotsom. Along them also disappeared the vast number of nobility who thrived at their courts. This was the class of society which patronised the various handicrafts and industries producing fine quality of luxury goods. The loss of demand and the market for these goods threw the workers on the street. They had to close their shops and seek employment elsewhere.

On the other hand, the Industrial Revolution had turned England from an agricultural country into "the workshop" of the whole world. Numerous big industries were set up which produced fine quality consumer goods much more cheaply than those produced by hand. Markets of the world were flooded with these goods and there was a demand from the industrial interests in England which in the end managed to dominate the whole political machinery of the then Government in that country for opening up and developing new markets everywhere. A vast market was found in the newly conquered sub-continent of India. In the absence of any protection, the native handicrafts and indigenous industries shrivelled and withered away. On the top of it all, the British Government took a number of strong measures to protect their own industries in England against certain Indian industries like that in cotton goods with which it was difficult for the former to compete.

All these stringent measures squeezed out the Indian craftsmen from their industries and they joined the ranks of those who had been reduced to mere agricultural labourers in the villages or became absorbed as factory and transport workers. Thus developed a new class of society which depended not on the security provided by the ancient customs of villages or patronage of the nobility and royalty but on the wages earned by them by their hands on the land and in the factory. This was comprised of both villagers and townsmen who joined hands for the first time to create a new feeling of comradeship, sharing the same feelings and thoughts and partaking of the same capitalist economy of the country which had newly arisen from the ashes of the obsolete disunited Indian society. Previously the

people were content and secure in their employment in the service of the society, of which they formed a permanent part. They never had the necessity of moving out of their immediate surroundings for the purpose of seeking out a living for themselves. But now when that fabric and structure of the ancient society was disrupted and they became adrift on the world, having lost their moorings, they had to fend for themselves. The people thrown out of agriculture sometimes took up employment as agricultural labourers on the lands they had themselves cultivated in the immediate past as equal to the landlords, who now became their masters. In other cases, they were compelled to move out of their homes in villages, where they had lived for ages, to seek employment in the growing industries in neighbouring towns. Similarly, craftsmen of the towns who were also facing a similar crisis in their lives, suddenly felt that they had been deprived of their livelihood by the drying up of the patronage under which they had prospered so long. They migrated to villages in some cases and became agricultural labourers. In other cases, they became factory workers. All this intense migration from one place of work to the other, and from town to the village, and vice versa led to an intermingling and a reshifting of different elements of the society which had so long been a closed one. It opened up new channels of thought and understanding. Therefore, in this misery of the masses there sprang up a new factor which contributed not in a small measure towards the development of the new wave of national consciousness.

Lack of adequate and quick means of transport and communications had been responsible for the weakness of the links of the vast Empires of Asoka, Ala-ud-din Khilji, Akbar, Aurangzeb and other great potentates. They felt this difficulty in dealing with their officers in charge of their outlying provinces and devised several arrangements but all such arrangements were costly and not within the reach of the common man. The problem of inadequate social contacts remained and the lives of the common people remained closed and secluded within the boundaries of their immediate villages and towns. There was insufficient intercourse even between people belonging to two neighbouring villages. Nerve-racking journeys by bullock-carts were too slow and tedious to be undertaken for long distances.

The British introduced the railways, constructed roads where they did not exist and improved those which needed repairs, set up regular postal and telegraph services. Buses were put on the roads. Journeys were made safer by ensuring better law and order position in the country. The purpose in introducing all these services, like so many other administrative reforms, was not philanthropic fundamentally, it arose out of the necessity of defending their newly conquered Empire which extended wide and far, and for this purpose quick and sure means of transport and communications were indispensable. But, as in the case of many other reforms introduced by the British, this also proved to be a boon in disguise to the Indian society. It brought people closer and enabled them to meet frequently for mutual exchange of views and discussion of their problems which by and by became common to all of them. This also in a way served to lessen the rigidity of caste system as the trains carried everyone in the same compartment and on the same bench irrespective of his caste. It also became possible to provide the people the benefit of listening to the views and ideas of artists, intellectuals and great leaders in their vicinity more often. The germs of nationalism which developed in the minds of a few only in the beginning, thus had a chance to spread to the general public and to foster a brotherhood of belonging to the same country and same nation. It would suffice to say that all these novel and swift means of communications enabled the Indians to know each other, their country, their nation, their economy, their problems and their viewpoints better than they would ever have done in any other way.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS TO NATIONAL CONSCIOUSNESS

It is true that at one time in their history the Indians had made tremendous strides in the field of science and knowledge. However, after this work the whole intellectual life of the society came to a stand-still and continued to remain at that level. Even this old and ancient knowledge in its out-moded form was monopolised by a small class of people, i.e., the Brahmins. The Indians, in general, were practically unlettered and knew next to nothing about the benefits of education except perhaps the rudiments of arithmetic etc.

The Christian missionaries were the pioneers in the introduction of modern education in India. They were inspired by their religious enthusiasm but, it is interesting to note that, while the new ideas and

the rational way of thinking taught by them in their secular institutions were avidly imbibed by the students studying there, their proselytising activities did not meet with any signal success. These were, however, essentially limited in their scope and extent. It fell to the share of Government to initiate a large-scale, systematic programme of education by setting up regular institutions which followed a set pattern of curriculum and instruction. The development of this educational system had to face many vicissitudes of fortune in the beginning and was introduced ultimately as a means to provide a large retinue of subordinate staff to man the administrative machinery. The progress of this new type of education through the medium of English language was slow. It was supported by enlightened Indian reformers like Raja Ram Mohan Roy. He was probably the first Indian to feel the necessity of regeneration of Indian society through the revitalising effect of modern education. It was primarily due to his enthusiasm and initiative that various voluntary organisations sprang up all over the country and helped in the spread of the gospel of new knowledge by establishing educational institutions of their own. The rational instruction given in the new institutions affected every aspect of the lives of the Indian people who came into contact with the new revolutionising theories of the West. There developed a new way of thinking which broke down the barriers between the people and contributed in a very large measure to awakening them to the realisation of a national unity and purpose.

The strong, centralised administration provided by the British gave a unity to the country which had been unknown before. Practically, throughout her history India was divided into various feudal States, ruled over by numerous petty chieftains. The efforts of the monarchs like Asoka, Samudragupta, Ala-ud-din Khilji, Akbar and others were directed only towards subduing these petty rulers and bringing their possessions into their fold. The various parts remained as disunited as before. The unity effected was superficial and in name only. There was no common economic factor affecting the lives of all the people. There was no uniform legal code according to which justice could be provided to everyone. All these defects were rectified by the administrative unity brought about by the British through the establishment of regularly constituted public services. A uniform legal system was set up. A common system of currency was also introduced.

Apart from all the factors discussed above, the advent of modern civilisation in India also introduced an innovation in the form of press. It was something new to this country. So far, the press, as it is understood now, was practically non-existent in India. The Indian monarchs employed news writers to keep themselves abreast of the day to day happenings within their kingdoms. Sometimes nobles and wealthy merchants also had their own news writers but the general public only heard, believed and spread rumours or obtained information broadcast by the public-crier by the beat of the drum. The introduction of press and newspapers gave a powerful weapon in the hands of the educated Indian people, although only a few at that time, to give vent to their views, opinions and ideas. It enabled them for the first time to preach their ideologies, to convey their beliefs and to discuss various problems which were common to all of them.

Again, Raja Ram Mohan Roy was the founder of the Indian Press. He brought out two papers; the *Sambad-Kaumudi* in Bengali in 1821 and the *Mirat-ul-Akbar* in Persian in 1822. In these papers he discussed national and political problems. These served to spread his gospel of social and religious reform. His example was followed by others and this novel and potent way of propaganda and publicity caught on like wild fire. Alongside the nationalist press the number and circulation of English papers also expanded. This expansion was very rapid after 1861. Most of the popular English newspapers like *The Times of India*, *The Statesman*, *Amrit Bazar Patrika* and *The Tribune* were started between the years 1861 and 1877.

Most of the newspapers which came into being as a result of the impact of Western civilisation, were devoted either to the support of the policies of the Government or at the most to a mild criticism of its actions. However, side by side with this moderate section of the Press, there also developed a small but very enthusiastic section of papers which enunciated and discussed in bold language the new ideology of struggle for national freedom. They preached the new doctrine with a fervour which led them sometimes to cross the limits imposed upon them by the Government, resulting in the imprisonment of their editors etc., on several occasions. But undaunted by these restrictions and deterrents of the Government, they continued their campaign with increasing tempo. The important newspapers in this category were *The Kesari* and *The Maratha* of Bal Gangadhar Tilak; *The Jugantar* and *The Bandematram* of Aurobindo Ghosh and

Barindra Ghosh. They were talented writers and believed in the justice of their cause with a degree of conviction which corresponded nearly to fanaticism. Their articles, which were outspoken sometimes, gave a fillip to the development of national consciousness. Of these, *The Kesri* was the most outstanding and effective channel in the hands of Tilak, through the columns of which the Architect of National Awakening created the feeling of a national spirit in the minds of his countrymen. It provided just the kind of caustic reasoning which was rational and at the same time fervently patriotic. His sincerity of approach was the best testimonial to convert people to his views and to draw the Nation to him like a magnet. His writings can justly be called the Gospel of Indian Freedom, on which the later generations drew freely to build up a single unified structure of Indian nation.

From the above discussion it should not be concluded that all these developments took place without any opposition from the British Government. Being conquerors they could not be expected to remain silent spectators to the growth of national feeling and demand for self-government and freedom. They were conquerors in a strange land, which they had won after a great struggle extending well over a century. The Government's reaction, which came in the wake of this revolution in the Indian mind and thought, was only a natural corollary to all the developments. As could be expected, the history of the Indian Press was a chequered one. Restrictions were imposed when the opinions expressed in the Press tended to get out of limits. Limitations were relaxed when the atmosphere tended to clear a bit and the dust of the virulent discussions seemed to have settled down. The Press was also affected by the personality and the whims of the individuals who were responsible for shaping the destiny of India of those days.

The repressive measures to check the vociferous activities of the Indian Press were introduced for the first time by Wellesley in 1799. Severe censorship was imposed and the papers which contravened these regulations were punished. This censorship and the majority of other restrictions imposed on the Press were removed in 1818. But these were re-introduced in 1823 and continued to be in force till 1835 when again these were repealed. After this the Press enjoyed certain amount of freedom till Mutiny in 1857. The outrages of Mutiny led to a change of heart on the part of the Govern-

ment which, with a spirit of vengeance, clamped the Press Act of 1877 on the Indian Press. This was the most repressive measure of its kind so far. Fortunately, this Act remained in force for only one year. In 1878 the Government passed another legislative measure called the Vernacular Press Act with a view to curbing the growing criticism of the vernacular press. It was subsequently repealed by Lord Ripon in 1882. After this the Indian Press enjoyed freedom till 1908. As a consequence, the nationalist elements in the Press increased to a great extent and the Government had perforce to pass two Acts in 1908 and 1910. The last one, the Press Act of 1910, was the severest enactment in the series of such legislative measures introduced so far by the Government in India. The Press was subjected to a very strict administrative control. Heavy securities were exacted from the papers and even on slight violations of the provisions of Act, their property including the printing presses were sequestered. This aroused a great unrest and a country-wide agitation against this measure was launched, thus uniting the country in a national cause probably for the first time. The united voice of the nation forced the Government to withdraw the Act and to liberalise other restrictions on the Press which remained comparatively free from official interference till 1930.

RELIGIOUS FACTOR

From times immemorial India has been known as the land of many religions. Hinduism and Islam are the two faiths which are professed by the vast majority of her people. As in the case of other factors, in religion too a stagnation and degeneration had set in the society. Hinduism was caste-ridden and had lost all the merits of its highly-developed philosophical systems. Moral and intellectual lives of its adherents had become barren of their spiritual values. The caste system divided the Hindus from one another so thoroughly that it was a mistake to say that they belonged to the same religion. They had nothing in common among themselves and, therefore, they could never hope to unite to work for a common cause. This abnoxious system made each caste an exclusive division whose members could never even think of altering or changing their social position. Islam was not so disintegrated in its structure, yet it also had its share of groupism in the form of two main divisions—Shias and Sunnis—who were also self-contained groups and did not hold any social intercourse between them.

The various factors and reforms which were introduced in the country by the British had their impact on the isolationist tendencies of caste system. New economic conditions forced the people to change their occupations, migrate from their ancestral villages to cities and live in circumstances and surroundings which rendered it impossible for them to observe all the strict principles of their castes. New means of transport and communications like railways forced the people belonging to different castes to travel side by side and thus break the insularity of their castes. Unlike the type of justice meted out by the caste panchayats the new judicial system was absolutely impartial. And, above all, as has been discussed in the earlier pages, the influence of modern education brought about a revolution in the way of thinking of the people which subordinated the religious factor to a rational approach to all the problems. The futility of the strict caste system laws and customs became apparent when viewed in the searchlight of the realistic instructions, imparted in the new institutions. The outcome of all this new current of thought was that several socio-religious movements came into being whose aim in general was to denounce the rigid caste system, to break down the barriers erected by these artificial divisions between men of the same religion and the same country, and to change their way of thought. It is the purpose of this heading to discuss these movements broadly.

Chronologically, the Brahmo Samaj was the first movement of this kind which was founded by Raja Ram Mohan Roy in 1828. In a way it was a social rather than a religious movement and reflected the character and personality of its founder as a social reformer much ahead of his times. O'Malley has described this nascent reformation movement in the Hindu society as representing the enlightened ideas of the elite among the Hindus. It held liberal views in regard to caste-system, child marriages, sati and the status and position of women in the society of those times. In this respect, therefore, it incorporated ideas which were directly opposed to the orthodox views held by the Hindu society in general. For this reason it could never expect to be a popular cult. In fact this revolutionary movement met with a stern and determined opposition. To counteract its influence and teachings, the orthodox members of Hindu society founded the Dharma Sabha with a view to extol the sanctity of old customs and religious rites. But the initiative of the Raja showed the way to other reformers and enlightened people for the reformation of the Hindu society which had become a stagnant pool. This also set

asfoot a re-thinking in the minds of the members of the orthodox society too. Even the opposition, with which it met, provided the push the Hindu society needed to move forward. For the first time after several centuries of static life, the Hindu society became active. After the Raja, the organisation of the Brnhmo Samaj was led by Debendranath Tagore and Keshab Chandra Sen. It was the latter who started opposition to the caste system in right earnest and in the sense of a real revolt against the existing Hindu society.

The new revolutionary ideas preached by the reform movements like the Brnhmo Samnj and the Prarthana Samaj led to some re-thinking in the minds of the leaders of orthodox society. They were convinced about the usefulness of old system, the supremacy of the old form of religions and the sanctity of the old customs which were established long long ago and had the sanction of the centuries behind them. But they were also convinced that the various extraneous usages and forms, which had crept in the religion later, were responsible for the down grading of the society. They, therefore, set about to remove these various ills and degenerating customs from the society to cleanse, in a way the Augean stables. The most outstanding movements in this direction were two-the Arya Samaj and the Ramakrishna Mission. The Arya Samaj was founded by Swami Dayanand Sarnswati in 1875. He preached the sanctity and infallibility of the old form of Hindu religion as founded and enunciated in the Vedas. He extolled the principles laid down in the old scriptures. According to him Vedas were the repository of all the knowledge. What was required was the right approach to their interpretation. The votaries of the Arya Samaj had to have implicit faith in their teachings and to be guided by the injunctions laid down in them for their lives. In the sphere of social reform, the Swami denounced complicated and useless rites and idolatory propagated by the Brahmins. The rigid hereditary caste-system was vehemently opposed. However, the four-fold division of the Hindu society, as laid down in the Vedas, was recognised without its accompaniment of untouchability. Women were given equal rights with men. The most conspicuous work done by the Samaj was in the establishment of a large number of educational institutions in which the modern education was imparted. A separate type of institutions called the Gurukuls in which the instruction was given based on the Vedas were also set up. Essentially, the teachings of the Arya Samaj were national in charac-

ter and democratic in spirit. They provided an active basis for the unity of the Hindu society by dissolving the insularity and the rigid caste barriers among people belonging to the same religion. However, it was narrow in its outlook in so far as it gave the supreme authority to the Vedas over everything which obviously could not be true always. All the same it played a very prominent part in the movement for bringing into being a national sentiment and character, a pride in the old institutions of India and a respect for the Indian culture as compared to the Western civilisation.

Another movement which deserves mention in this connection is the Ramakrishna Mission Movement. It was inspired by the austere, simple and dedicated life of Rama Krishna, a Hindu saint, who like Chaitanya Mahaprabhu and others in this line, preached love among human beings, devotion to one God and humility. His life was full of several instances from which the people could get inspiration and reform their lives. The person responsible for the propagation of the teachings of Rama Krishna and who could be called the real founder of the movement was Swami Vivekananda. He was a disciple of Rama Krishna. He was a great orator and had a strong conviction in his belief. The main aim of the Mission was to extol the supremacy and high standard of ancient Indian culture. It is interesting to note that the Mission supported idolatry and worship of the large pantheon of gods. Swami Vivekananda visited foreign countries and lectured extensively. The main theme of his talks was the pride in the Indian culture and ancient customs. Many people were profoundly impressed by him and even today there are several votaries of the Mission in Western countries, particularly in the U.S.A.

In addition to all the above movements discussed in the foregoing paragraphs, there was a unique religio-social movement which was started by a non-Indian. It is called the Theosophical Movement and was introduced in 1879 by Madame Blavatsky. Its aim was to establish a universal brotherhood of people irrespective of caste, creed or sex. Essentially, Madame Blavatsky was influenced in her outlook by the tenets of Hinduism like transmigration of soul and other religious philosophies. However, as this movement was based on liberal principles for which the people of India were not yet prepared, it could not be popular and failed to catch on.

As compared to the Hindus, the Muslims were more orthodox and very reticent in adopting reforms which were necessitated by the

changing circumstances. For a long time they refused to incorporate any new ideas and thereby benefit from the new rational trends in education. They continued to plod along in the old grooves of their strict and rigid religious principles, long after the Hindus had brought about several far-reaching changes in their society. Thus, it was no surprise that in the new civilisation, which was being established in India, Muslims played such a small part. The closed democratic-type institutions of Islam prevented their readily participating in a national unity forged out of the joint efforts of all the communities in the country.

The realisation of the relative backwardness of the Muslim community was the factor which was responsible for the inauguration of a nationalist movement among them. Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan was its founder. His aim was to rouse in the Muslims the consciousness of their shortcomings and to open for them the avenues of modern education. With this end in view he set up the Mohammedan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh in 1875 which developed into Aligarh University fifteen years later mainly due to his initiative and enthusiasm. He also started the All-India Muslim Educational Conference.

There were several other minor movements aiming at reforming the Muslim community which were started in the wake of the path blazed by Sir Sayyid Ahmed Khan but they were not very popular. On the whole, Muslim community, due to its fanatical adherence to its religious injunctions has tenaciously resisted all efforts at reform and not participating more fully like Hindus in the cause of national awakening.

Religious factor being the most important factor in the Indian society, the effect of all the reform movements described above was to create an atmosphere for the development of a feeling of national consciousness by breaking down the caste barriers which had so long separated man from man. However, the barriers were not broken down completely. They have not been done even now, and remain standing like mountains amidst our national independence.

POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS

In the foregoing pages we have discussed certain factors which affected the society and the national life in India in such a way that the Indians for the first time in their history realised that they all had a common purpose. This realisation which dawned quite

slowly led to the development of political institutions which had so far been unknown in this country. The objective of all these political movements was to oppose the oppressive and anti-Indian measures of the Government and to strive for more and more share in the administration of the country. While the interests of the British were mainly governed by their desire to keep a strong and effective control over the country they had conquered, the nascent national consciousness aimed at subordinating these narrow interests to the larger national interests. Thus, the two were bound to come into conflict with each other sooner or later. This struggle further strengthened the spirit of nationalism, and, frustrated efforts in some cases and successful campaigns in others, induced these movements to greater efforts and higher ideals. In this way the political institutions became more and more well-defined and nationalistic in their outlook and objectives.

The beginning of this political upheaval and organisation of national life can be traced as far back as 1843 and 1851 which saw the establishment of the Indian Society and the British Indian Association respectively. These organisations were more groups of a few individuals and cannot be said to have been popular movements. They only submitted memorials to the Government for relaxation of certain restrictions and amendment of certain procedures of administration. For example in a memorial submitted to the Parliament the British Indian Association suggested improvements in the life of the people by giving protection and encouragement to the Indian industries and manufactures. It also asked for greater representation of the Indians in the higher administrative services and the Central legislature.

These feeble attempts did not achieve anything at all. The newly generated feelings of nationalism and dis-satisfaction against the galling foreign rule continued to be as irritated as ever. Under this stress and strain the popular feelings were bottled up for want of any adequate outlet and at last found expression in 1857 when they burst out. The rising was suppressed ruthlessly and stern steps were taken to prevent the recurrence of such an event. However, it had one fortunate result is that it gave a new orientation to the British Policy in India which henceforward became more realistic and related to the life of the people.

∴ The period from 1857 to 1885 witnessed the inter-play between two conflicting factors. On the one hand, the atrocities committed

during the rising by both the sides created a sense of anger and vengeance which was responsible for the drifting apart of the two peoples. On the other hand, the blood-bath of 1857 made it abundantly clear that the main reason for the British being caught unawares and the Indians being antagonised was that the then prevailing administrative system did not provide for any opportunity to the Government to keep itself in touch with the people. Thus, while the British Government in India wanted to re-orientate their administration in such a way as to be able to ascertain the popular reaction to the various measures, the estranged relations of the British with the Indians forced them to enact and introduce repressive measures.

The first example of this new trend in the political life of India was the Queen's Proclamation of 1858 which is sometimes called the 'Magna Carta' of the Indian people. Among other things promised therein were the undertakings to respect the rights and customs of the Indian people, to faithfully observe the treaties and agreements entered into by the Company with the Indian rulers and to abstain from further extension of the territories. In order to create a favourable atmosphere and to alleviate the strained relations between the ruler and the ruled, it was decided to grant a general amnesty to all except those responsible for murders. The most important provision contained in the Proclamation was that which promised greater participation of the Indians in the administration of the country by their appointment to the services.

The Government of India Act of 1858 defined the Constitution of India in its new perspective and introduced several changes in the administrative system. For the purposes of our study, however, this Act is important only in a limited sense. It brought an end to the rule of the East India Company and India became a British colony which it had in fact been for several decades. For about a century and a half the British Empire in India had been building up slowly but steadily under the guise of a commercial enterprise controlled by a trading establishment. Mass of the people still believed in the worn-out fiction of the supremacy of the Mughal Emperor. This was shattered now. The guise was taken off and blatantly with a rough suddenness the British assumed the role of the supreme power. Probably this realisation of the supplanting of supreme authority by an alien power was not so acute at that time as the

spirit of national consciousness was just sprouting up. But this action gave a jolt to the age-old feelings of being governed by a native Emperor. Whatever might have been the views held at that time by the public but the British, after having thrown off the veil of traders, appeared to them as the new edition of the Huns, Mahmud Ghaznavi and other grasping invaders.

However, it can be said to the credit of the British that they tried to associate Indians with the administration of the country, even though out of necessity. Their first step in this direction was the Indian Councils Act of 1861. Certain differences between the Central Government and the Government of Madras led to its enactment and it aimed at defining the legislative powers of the Central and Provincial Governments more clearly. Besides this, a sincere attempt was also made to have the benefit of the Indian view-point. Of course, there was no question of giving representation to the people at that stage. However, the Indian chiefs and nobles were included in the various Councils for the first time.

In the same year, however, the Indian Civil Service Act was passed which lowered the maximum age for taking the competitive examination for recruitment to the Indian Civil Service to 22. (It was further lowered to 21 in 1866 and 19 in 1879). This action excluded most of the Indians from competing for the Indian Civil Service Examination. Further, this was against the promises made in the Proclamation of 1858 and created a sense of frustration and defiance in the minds of the Indian youth. It led to a strong opposition and a country-wide agitation under the leadership of Shri S. N. Bannerjee. The nascent spirit of nationalism was thus provided with another platform or another source of strength.

The smouldering fire of agitation was fanned by the repressive measures of Lord Lytton. These were the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 and the Indian Arms Act of the same year. The former restricted the freedom of the Indian Press and the latter made the possession of arms without licence by the Indians a criminal offence but exempted the Europeans from its operation. This bitter racial discrimination was accentuated by the controversy over the Ilbert Bill. The Bill sought to put the Europeans and the Indians at par with each other before the courts of law. This created a great uproar by the

Europeans who did not want this discrimination to end. They organised a Defence Association and raised contributions. Meetings were held all over India at which inflammatory speeches were delivered. The Government was forced down to its knees and the Bill was defeated. However, this agitation acted as a stimulant to the cause of the growing national consciousness. While on the one hand it made it clear to the Indians that they could not expect any justice from their new rulers, on the other it showed them what organised resistance was and how it forced the Government to yield. With embittered feelings in their hearts they entrenched themselves for a prolonged fight to secure their lost freedom.

The first organised protest against the policy of the British was a big meeting held in Calcutta on the 24th March, 1877, under the auspices of the Indian Association, in connection with the Indian Civil Service question. A memorandum was adopted and Mr. Lal Mohan Ghose was deputed to present it to the British Parliament.

This was of course, only a small and limited beginning and did not provide an adequate platform to the new awakening that was growing up in the country. New education had enabled the Indians to acquaint themselves with the freedom movements in other countries like Italy, America, Ireland, etc. The history of these countries enthused them to follow in their footsteps and to organise similar movements. The liberal-minded literature of the West, which was brought within the reach of the Indians through the agency of the English language, opened up new vistas of broad vision, taught the sanctity of individual liberty, freedom of thoughts and the national independence. These teachings and the new aspirations of the Indians were channelled through the Indian Press, which, in spite of all the muzzling of its activities through a number of severe and crippling restrictions placed on it, was mainly responsible for providing a lead to the general masses to unite under a single banner of nationalism.

The sharp cleavage between the interests and the views of the Indians on the one hand and the Europeans, Anglo-Indians and the Government on the other, led to the development of a feeling of common interest and a sense of belonging to the same nation. The necessity of defending their rights and offering organised resistance to the repressive measures introduced by the Government which affected every Indian equally, was responsible for uniting them. This growing unrest was becoming more and more pronounced every day

and the intelligentsia of the country began to fear that unless some outlet was found for the expression of discontent, it might flare up the passions and the terrible nightmares of 1857 might be repeated. The initiative was given by Mr. O.A. Hume, the founder of the Indian National Congress though his efforts were preceded by the formation of a number of public organisations like the National League, the Indian Association of Bengal, the Bombay Association, the Bombay Presidency Association, the Mahajan Sabha of Madras and the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha. But all these bodies were only mushroom growths and of local importance. They cannot be called national organisations in the true sense of the term. This status was enjoyed by the Indian National Congress, set up in 1885.

POLITICS

On the 1st March, 1883, Mr. Hume wrote an open letter to the graduates of the Calcutta University, asking them to enrol themselves in the service of their country by adhering to the principles of truth and self-sacrifice. A meeting of 17 representatives of the various parts of the country, who had gone to attend the annual convention of Theosophical Society at Madras, was held in December, 1884. They resolved to work for the establishment of a national body. An Indian Union was formed and at the instance of Mr. Hume who had discussed the matter with the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, a manifesto was issued in 1885. The Indian National Congress was born.

The first meeting of this historic national organisation which has since monopolised the political scene in the country, was held at Bombay on the 28th December, 1885, under the Presidentship of Mr. W. C. Bonnerjee. The objectives of the Congress were enunciated at this session. These were :—

- (i) To provide a common meeting ground for all the workers in the service of the country so that they could know each other.
- (ii) To eliminate racial, provincial and religious differences among the Indians and to strengthen the spirit of nationalism.
- (iii) To discuss the important questions and problems of the country and to record the views of the educated Indians on these.

(iv) To decide upon the programme for the next year. These objectives represent the aims of the founder of the Congress. Mr. Hume, who wanted it to be a platform for the ventilation of social grievances by the Indians, and, the desire of Lord Dufferin to create a political forum in the country wherein the educated Indians could express their views on the defects in the administration and make suggestions for improvements.

Thus, for the first time, educated and enlightened Indians met together and, after deliberating upon national problems, presented petitions to the Government for several reforms, like, examinations for the recruitment to Indian Civil Service, constitution of the Councils, etc. These demands were very modest and humble and were not meant to be a criticism or opposition to the Government. Rather, the Congress provided the sorely-needed agency to the Government through which it could know the views held by the educated Indians on various measures undertaken by it.

In its initial stages the Congress was led by a group of Indians who have been given the name of Liberal politicians. Under their guidance it faithfully kept to the path chalked out for it, *i.e.*, to aid the Government. They held the view that it was in the interest of India to go hand in hand with England. They sought guidance from the British to remove the backwardness of the Indians. Their aim was friendship between the two countries. Thus, they rejected all ideas of revolution, agitation or violence. Views bearing on this policy of peaceful co-existence and pacific reformation were expressed on several occasions by the leaders of Liberal politicians like Surendra Nath Bannerjee and Dadabhai Naoroji.

In view of this policy of the Indian National Congress, the attitude of the Government towards it was sympathetic. However, as could have been expected, when the petitions presented by it remained merely protests on paper, the resulting frustration perceptibly changed the tone of its discussions and the memoranda to that of a criticism of the actions of the Government and assertion of the rights of the people. The movement, therefore, lost the sympathy of the Government after it had met only twice. But in this organisation the British Government had caught a Tartar. The actions and the activities of the organisation began to be viewed with great interest both in India and abroad which alarmed the Government. All Government co-

operation to the Congress was withdrawn from 1888 onwards. The Government servants were prohibited from attending its meetings.

The salutary effects of the organised campaign of securing the interests of the nation were, however, soon obvious. The reformation of the various executive and legislative councils, set up by the British in India, which the Congress advocated, was taken up by the Government quite seriously and most of the suggestions offered by the Congress were incorporated in the Indian Councils Act of 1892. By it the Supreme Council and the Provincial Councils were expanded. Powers were given to the Governor General-in-Council to frame rules for nomination of additional members to these Councils and the principle of indirect election of representatives was adopted. Restrictions placed on the functions of the councils were removed and they were allowed to discuss the budget freely even though they could not vote. The right of asking questions of the Government was also conceded. The Act of 1892 was, thus, an important landmark in the direction of the fulfilment of the political aspirations of the Indian people.

The year 1892 marked the end of one phase of the development of national awakening in India and the beginning of a period of turmoil in the politics of the country. The group of Liberal politicians was divided into two distinct schools of thought. One of these could be called by the now well-known terminology of Rightists or Liberals and the other by the name of Leftists or Extremists. While the former believed in peaceful and constitutional means and in a policy of conciliation to persuade the Government to give them more and more self-Government, the latter believed in using the extreme and violent methods to terrorise the Government into submitting to their demands for conceding the rights of the Indians. The leaders of the Rightists or the Liberals were Dadabhai Naoroji, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Pherozeshah Mehta and Surendranath Bannerjee. The Leftist group or the Extremists were led by Bal Gangadhar Tilak, Aurobindo Ghosh, Bipin Chander Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai, A. K. Dutt and several others equally daring who were prepared to sacrifice their all including their lives for the national cause. The history of the national awakening after 1892 is mainly a story of the contribution made by these selfless workers and the leaders and architects of the Indian nation. It would, therefore, be quite pertinent here to shift our focus from a general survey of the development of various factors responsible for

the numerous changes that were being brought about in the structure of the Indian society and consequently in the political atmosphere of India, to the study of the contributions made by these eminent politicians.

In the ensuing struggle the true Liberals did not play a prominent part although their contribution to the cause cannot be ignored. Their methods of peaceful protestation and submission of memoranda to the Government appealing to their good sense were unsuitable in the face of the circumstances then existing but by sheer force of their personalities and individual capabilities they had their impact on the pace and the history of nationalist movement. Dadabhai Naoroji was one of these statesmen. He was a true Liberal of the old school. He was a member of the British House of Commons and advocated the cause of his countrymen in the British Parliament in a dignified and conciliatory manner which excited the admiration of everyone. It was largely through his efforts that the resolution in favour of holding simultaneous examinations in India and England for recruitment to the I.C.S. was passed in 1893. He considered the British rulers as 'benefactors' whose benefactions should be remembered by the Indians for all times to come. While he was fully alive to the demand for self-government and for other democratic institutions, he also knew that his countrymen were not yet ready to assume such responsibilities. He believed that the first task before the statesmen and social workers was to educate the people. It should not, however, be concluded from all this that he deliberately shut his eyes to the fact that the position of the British in India was that of invaders. On several occasions he gave vent to his feelings. The ideal of Swaraj was brought forth by him when he presided over the Congress session in 1906.

Another personality among the Liberals who deserves mention is Gopal Krishna Gokhale. He was a pure-hearted and gentle statesman and dedicated his immense abilities to the national cause. He was the President of the Congress when he was only 39. Even Mahatma Gandhi drew inspiration for his political ideals from the life and work of Gokhale. His abilities were praised both in India and abroad. In his evidence before the Welby Commission he advocated the Indian cause in a masterly manner. His address to Lord Curzon commenting upon several problems, is an important document. In that he exhorted the British to rule over India keeping in view the interests

of the Indians and to orientate their policies in such a way as to subserve the good of the country both in moral and material sense. He protested against the inadequate financial allocations for educational schemes. He compared the figures of expenditure on education in India with those in England and deplored the neglect by the Government. He strongly protested against the partition of Bengal and expressed his contempt for this bureaucratic action in the face of stern opposition. In a similar address to Lord Minto he impressed upon the Government the importance of two great national problems—the improvement of the conditions of the people and the conciliation of the educated classes in India. In sympathy with the statesmen of his group he did not want to antagonise the British and believed in securing all their goodwill and friendship for his countrymen.

These peaceful and uncertain methods did not suit the taste of the youthful and therefore the more enthusiastic and ebullient elements in the national movement wanted to resort to a direct action. This was the aim of the Extremist group which became very popular in the country as the champions of national movement. The beginnings of this phase of the Indian nationalism can be traced to the activities of Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak in Maharashtra about the year 1890. There he organised youngmen of his religion in different clubs and societies just like Shivaji had done before him. These clubs and societies became very popular and served as a useful means for instilling political consciousness among the people. Tilak's activities gave the political movement a fanatic turn and the propaganda carried on by him through the fiery columns of his outspoken paper, the "Kesari", served to inflame the popular opinion against the British. Two British officers were murdered at Poona by members of a 'Society for the removal of obstacles to Hindu religion'. The persons responsible for this were caught and hanged. A campaign was started by the Anglo-Indian community for placing restrictions on the Kesari and other Indian papers. Tilak was arrested and tried before a young English judge. He was sentenced to 15 months' rigorous imprisonment.

There was a countrywide clamour for the unjust punishment inflicted on Tilak. A petition signed by various important personages was presented to Queen Victoria with the result that Tilak was released six months before the expiry of his term. This incident brought him to the forefront of the national movement.

For about five years there was a lull in the political atmosphere of the country which culminated in 1905 in the Partition of Bengal. The development, more than any other, was responsible for the unification of the Indians for a national cause and the creation of a determined opposition to the British. Public meetings were held all over Bengal to protest against the partition. At a mammoth meeting held in Calcutta, Surendra Nath Bannerjee administered a Boycott pledge to the people and Swadeshi resolution was passed. The partition was carried out in the face of the united opposition of the whole country. And then the storm burst. The Boycott pledge and Swadeshi resolution became the popular foundations of a national agitation. To consolidate the united agitation, a Federation Hall was founded and a National Fund was started. Surendra Nath Bannerjee and Bipin Chandra Pal toured extensively and spoke to their countrymen about the high-handed action of the Government. Through the Press and the Congress session of 1905 the two movements of political boycott and Swadeshi gained momentum. Government used force to break up the meetings convened for the two movements. The preachers were arrested and imprisoned. At this time *Bande Matram* became the most popular patriotic song. So much so that the Government banned its singing. The use of violence and force by the Government only served to further incense the injured feelings. The more extreme and violent measures the Government took to check the spread of agitation, the more popular the whole movement became. The most notorious of the actions of the Government was the dispersion of the Bengal Provincial Conference at Barisal by force in 1906.

Another method used by the Government in meeting this opposition of the public was by the famous principle of 'Divide and Rule'. They created a rift between Hindus and Muslims by favouring the latter in the newly created province of Bengal. There were also riots between the two communities. This one-sided policy followed by the Government led to the emergence of a new group in the party of the Extremists in Bengal. It was distinctly revolutionary and believed in the use of force and arms to terrorise the Government into submission. The other group who did not favour the use of violence was led by Aurobindo Ghose. As in the case of the Liberals, the latter group of Extremists preached the ideal of independence and other democratic institutions very powerfully through

their papers the "New India" and the "Bande Matram". They believed in the programme of action based on the twin movements of Swadeshi and Boycott of British goods and Government service.

However, the new revolutionary party which had emerged was conspicuous by its nascent enthusiasm. It was led by Barindra Kumar Ghose, brother of Aurobindo Ghose and Bhupendra Nath Dutt, brother of Swami Vivekananda. They preached their new doctrines through their papers "Yugantra" and "Sandhya". The plan of action put forth by them consisted of the following :—

- (i) Vigorous campaign through the Press to make the Indians realise the yoke of alien rule.
- (ii) Propagation of the ideals of freedom and love of Motherland.
- (iii) Arranging demonstrations and agitations against the British.
- (iv) Organisation of small secret parties of disciplined young-men, devoted to the national cause and trained in the use of arms, whose patriotic instinct was aroused by religious and propagandist literature and teachings. Their job was to terrorise the Government by throwing bombs, carrying on raids etc.

It was mainly by the fourth item that the revolutionary party distinguished itself from the remanant extremist group of the nationalist movement.

The activities of the new revolutionary party, though not concentrated at one place, were first prominent in Bengal where, in fact the movement was born. There were several cases of violence such as the attempt to blow up the train of Lieutenant-Governor near Midnapore in 1907 and the shooting of British Magistrate of Dacca. However, the most important incident which shook the whole British Government was the unfortunate killing of two innocent English ladies in 1908 by mistake. The persons responsible for the act were arrested. One of them shot himself dead but the other, Khudi Ram Bose, was tried and hanged. He became a martyr. Another case which also deserves mention is the famous Alipore Conspiracy case. In a raid by the police, arms, ammunition and revolutionary literature were seized in Calcutta and several leaders of the party including Aurobindo Ghose and Barindra Kumar Ghose

were arrested. In the trial that was held before the session court, Aurobindo Ghose and a few others were acquitted while severe punishments were awarded to others.

In Maharashtra the party was led by Savarkar brothers. Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, the younger brother, directed the movement from London. He founded the revolutionary society named Abhinav Bharat Society (Young India Society) in 1899. He wrote 'The Indian War of Independence, 1857' and other books which became popular with the revolutionaries. The members of the Society practised the use of arms and weapons. The elder brother, Ganesh Savarkar, carried on the movement in India and was arrested in 1909 on the charges of conspiring against the King by publishing a series of inflammatory poems by the title of *Laghū Abhinav Mela*. Ganesh was transported for life. This and the news regarding the punishment inflicted on the revolutionaries in Bengal led the India Home Rule party in England to vow vengeance against the British. Madan Lal Dhingra shot down the Political A.D.C. at the India Office. He was arrested and executed. Vinayak Savarkar was also arrested and sent to India. He was tried and sentenced to transportation for life. However, this did not discourage the members of the Young India Society. District Magistrate of Nasik, Mr. Jackson, was shot and three members of the Society were executed. During the course of investigations the Government discovered the Nasik Conspiracy. In the latter case 38 persons were tried, of whom 27 were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment.

Similar agitation, though not so revolutionary in character, was also carried on in Punjab in the years 1907-8. The cause of the movement was mainly agrarian. There was great discontent due to increase in the land revenue and over the controversial Colonisation Bill. An 'Indian Patriots Association' led by Ajit Singh and Syed Hyder Raza was formed. Various meetings were held at which leaders including Lala Lajpat Rai spoke to the people exhorting them to resist the Government. The prominent persons were arrested and tried by the District Magistrate of Rawalpindi. As the trial was postponed, the crowd, which had gathered outside the Court, became restive and broke out into a riot. For this riot six lawyers including Lala Lajpat Rai were arrested but later on released after being kept in jail in great discomfort for about five months. The situation in

Punjab improved when the Colonisation Bill was vetoed by Lord Minto.

All this unrest made the British Government, both in India and in England, uncomfortable and the new Viceroy, Lord Minto, explored the various ways to control the situation. One of these was his suggestion to Lord Morley to give separate representation to the Muslims in the elections on the initiative of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan who had founded the Muslim League in 1906. This was, however, not accepted at that time.

Lord Minto reviewed the whole situation in his famous minute of 1906. In that he observed that owing to the spread of education in India and the enlightenment of the Indians due to the progressive ideas imbibed from the West, the political question in India could not be ignored. He suggested the evolution of a system of democratic institutions based on both the autocracy of the Mughals and the constitutional set-up of the British. Lord Morley agreed with the Viceroy and the reforms suggested by the latter with a view to giving effect to his ideas were passed into an Act in 1909. The Act enlarged the size of the councils and adopted the principles of election and nomination. The regulations for elections were framed with an eye on the maintenance of an official majority and a fair representation to different classes and interests in the country was also provided for. These councils were only advisory in character and had no power worth the name. The members were allowed to move resolutions on budget and other matters of public interest. The practice of interpellation through asking questions and supplementary questions from the executive was also introduced. However, these reforms did not provide any answer to the Indian political problem. As proclaimed by Lord Morley in his famous disclaimer, the purpose of these reforms was not to establish any Parliamentary system of Government in India. And, in reality, it did not set up any such system. The election procedure introduced was narrow-minded and did not provide any opportunity to the people to exercise their vote except in certain special circumstances and conditions. There was no responsible executive answerable to elected councils. The worst defect of the Act was the introduction of communal electorates. With all these shortcomings the Act proved to be just a package of empty shells without any substance in it.

There was an all-round disillusionment and the agitations again broke out all over the country. Only the Liberals of the old school were satisfied with these reforms. They brought forward certain useful legislative measures in the councils like the Elementary Education Bill of Gokhale. On the whole, however, the situation became as explosive as before the introduction of the reforms. The revolutionaries again became active, particularly in Eastern Bengal and Punjab. The situation was very badly handled by the British officers in these provinces. In Eastern Bengal the Lieutenant-Governor wanted to overawe the people by placing troops on guard at several places, considered to be trouble-spots. He asked the Calcutta University to disaffiliate the schools whose students joined the anti-British activities. However, this was not considered to be a wise step. It only served to incense the injured feelings of the people still further.

In Punjab instead of alleviating the distress of the agriculturists the Government employed repressive measures to stamp out the movement. Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh had become national figures by their active participation in the struggle. The provincial Government was alarmed at their growing prominence and suggested to the Central Government that they should be deported from India. The Governor-General-in-Council agreed to the proposal and consequently both of them were deported to Burma in 1907. Strict measures were enforced to prevent the holding of public meetings.

There were repercussions in Bengal against these persecutions. This led the Government to prosecute several papers chiefly *Bande Matram*, *Sandhya* and *Yugantar*. Various repressive measures were enforced by the Government. The first of these was the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act of 1907. Under it three days' notice of every meeting of more than 20 persons was required to be given. The definition of public meeting was very wide and embraced even the social and private meetings. To meet the challenge of a vast number of secret revolutionary societies the Government enacted two legislations—the Explosive Substances Act and the Newspapers (Incitement to offences) Act. Under the former, anyone in possession of materials and implements used in the manufacture of explosive was to be deported for 14 years. Under the second Act, a District Magistrate could seize the printing press if he was satisfied that it was used to print papers which contained matter inciting people to acts of violence,

All these measures were opposed by Lord Morley but Lord Minto went ahead without pausing to consider the result of his measures. Several prosecutions were started against the native papers. The most important of these was the one instituted against Tilak. It was tried by the Session Court in 1908 and Tilak was sentenced to six years' transportation. It was widely resented and to show their sympathy for Tilak markets were closed, students absented themselves from their institutions and the labourers observed hartal for six days. The last Act in this series of repressive measures was the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act of 1908 which laid down a special procedure for the trial of the revolutionaries, and associations. Under this Act several leaders were deported.

At this time there were several incidents of murdering of Europeans and throwing of bombs on trains, etc. The history of the national movement between 1907 and the starting of the First World War is one of bomb outrages and murders. Several new revolutionary parties like the Ghadr and Khilafat movements sprang up and the old ones became very active. This spate of violence forced the Government to deal with the situation in a more tactful manner. George V visited India in 1911 and a Darbar was held at Delhi. One of the several announcements was the annulment of the partition of Bengal. The provinces were promised a larger measure of self-Government. However, in spite of this there was an attempt at the life of Lord Hardinge, the then Viceroy.

After the War was over the Government announced the promised concessions in 1917. For the first time a system of responsible executive to the elected legislature was introduced. The provincial legislatures were given more powers and a regulated system of devolution of powers. All these reforms were incorporated in the Government of India Act, 1919 which marked an important stage in the progress of the national movement. However, the concessions given were not up to the expectation of the people who had in the meantime set their hearts at the higher ideals of freedom of the country from the foreign yoke. At this juncture Mahatma Gandhi appeared on the political scene of India and the whole trend of the national movement underwent a new orientation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, W.H. Dnyenport. The Makers of British India.
2. Anderson, Tarikhi Bahadur Shahi (Translnted). Cal. 1860.
3. Andrews and Mookerjee, The Rise and Growth of the Congress 1938.
4. Bnlfour, Lady Betty. Lord Lytton's Indian Administration. 1899.
5. Basu, B. D. India under the British Crown 1933.
6. Besant, Annie. How India Wrought For Freedom.
7. Bevan, Edwin. Indian Nationalism.
8. Bose, N. S. The Indian awakening and Bengal.
9. Bose, Subhas Chandra. Rise and growth of Indian Struggle 1934.
10. Buch, M.A. Rise And growth of Indian Liberalism.
11. Carr, E.H. Nationalism 1939.
12. Chailley, Joseph. Administrative problems of British India 1910.
13. Charles Ball. History of the Indian Mutiny (Vols., 1 & 2.)
14. Chintamani, C. Y. Indian Politics Since the Mutiny 1937.
15. Chirol, V. Indian Unrest 1910.
16. Chirol, V. India (1926).
17. Desai, A.R. Social Background of Indian Nationalism 1959.
18. Dodwell, Henry. A Sketch of the History of India (1858—1918.)
19. Dutt, K.K. Biography of Kunwar Singh and Amar Singh.
20. Dutt, R.C. Economic History of British India Under British Rule 1901.
21. Eastwick, W.G. Lord Lytton and the Afghan Wnr 1879.
22. Forrest, G.W. A History of the Indian Mutiny (Vols. 1 & 2.)
23. Ghosh, Dalip Kumar. England and Afghnnistan.
24. Gooch, G.P. Nationalism 1920.
25. Hensman, H. The Afghan War (1879-80).
26. Holmes, T.R.E. A History of the Indian Mutiny.
27. Hunter, Sir William Wilson. The Earl of Mayo (Rulers of India).
28. Hussain, Mahdi. Bahadur Shah II And the War of 1857 in Delhi with its Unforgettable Scene.
29. John Buchan. Lord Minto, a memoir.
30. Karmarkar, D.P. Bal Gangadhar Tilak. A Study 1956.
31. Karunakaram, K.P. Modern Indian Political Tradition 1962.
32. Kaye, J. W. A History of the Sepoy War in India, (1857-1858) (Vols. I-III.)
33. Kaye and Malleeson. History of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-58 (Vols. I-II.)
34. Keith, A.B. A Constitutional History of India, 1936.
35. Lovett, Verney. History of the Indian National Movement 1919.
36. Lucien Wolf. Life of Lord Ripon. (Vols. 1 and 2.)

37. Lyall, Alfred. The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava. (Vols. I-II.)
38. Macdonald, J. R. The Awakening of India 1910.
39. Macmunn, Sir George. The Indian Mutiny in Perspective.
40. Macmunn, Sir George. Afghanistan From Darius to Amanullah 1929.
41. Majumdar, R.C. The Sepoy Mutiny and the Revolt of 1857.
42. Majumdar, R.C. History of the Freedom Movement in India. (Vols. 1 & 2.)
43. Malleson, G.B. The Indian Mutiny of 1857.
44. Marchioness of Dufferin & Ava. Our Viceregal Life in India.
45. Mary, Countess of Minto. India of Minto and Morley (1905—1910).
46. Masani, R.P. Dadabhai Naoroji 1960.
47. Mersey, Viscount The Viceroys and Governors—General of India (1751—1947).
48. Michael Edwardes. Battles of the Indian Mutiny.
49. Natarajan, S. Social Problems 1942.
50. Nehru, Jawahar Lal. An Autobiography.
51. Newton, Lord. Lord Lansdowne. A Biography 1929.
52. O'Malley, L.S.S. Modern India and the West 1941.
53. Pakistan-Historical Society Publication. A History of the freedom Movement (1831—1905) (Vol. III Part I.)
54. Parvate, T.V. Gopal Krishna Gokhale.
55. Paul, K.T. The British Connection with India.
56. Richey, J.A. Selections from the Educational Records (Part I & II).
57. Ronaldshay, Lord. Life of Lord Curzon (Vols. 1 & 2.)
58. Roy, N.C. Indian Civil Service, 1935.
59. Sen, Surendra Nath. Eighteen Fiftyseven.
60. Sharma, Sri Ram. Constitutional History of India (1765—1954)
61. Singh, Hira Lal. Problems and Policies of the British in India.
62. Sitaramayya, P. The History of the Indian National Congress.
63. Smith, R. Bosworth. Life of Lord Lawrence.
64. Smith, W. Roy. Nationalism and Reforms in India.
65. Stephen, Wheeler. The Amir Abdur Rahman.
66. Strachey, John. India : its Administration and Progress.
67. Tagore, Rabindra Nath. Nationalism 1917.
68. Trotter, Lionel. History of India Under Queen Victoria (1835—1880).
69. Vajpeyi, J. N. The Political Movement in India (1905—1929) (Vol. I.)
70. Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. India Under Ripon. A Private Diary 1909.
71. Woodruff, Phillip. The Men Who Ruled India.
72. British India by an Indian Mohomedan with a foreword by Theodore Morison.

INDEX

A

- Abdulla Jan 51, 59, 60, 132, 136
 Abdur Reuman Khan, 65, 66, 82,
 85, 90, 91, 92, 93, 129, 130,
 138, 139, 140
 Act of 1861 *See* under Acts
Acts
 Act of 1861, 24, 25, 26
 Ancient Monuments Preservation
 Act-1904, 105
 Arms Act-1861, 78, 160
 Bengal Rent Act-1859, 28, 69
 Calcutta Corporation Act, 102,
 106
 Charter Act, 24
 Explosive Substances Act, 171
 Government of India Act-1858,
 21, 159
 Ilbert Bill, 73, 75, 160
 Indian Civil Services Act-1861,
 160
 Indian Council Act-1892, 87, 88,
 160, 164
 Indian Criminal Law Amendment
 Act, 116, 172
 Newspapers (Incitement to Offences)
 Act, 171
 Press Act-1908, 153, 160
 Prevention of Seditious Meetings
 Act, 1907, 104
 Punjab Land Alienation Act-
 1900, 104
 Reforms Act-1909, 117, 124
 Vernacular Press Act-1882, 65,
 153
 Afghan War, First, 42, 128
 Afzal Mohammed *See* Mohammed
 Afzal
 Agha Khan, 116
 Agricultural Cooperative Societies,
 104
 Ahmed Ullah, Maulvi, 7, 17
 Almerst, Lord, 183
 Aitchison, Sir, 74
 Ajit Singh, 115
 Akbar, 11, 12, 148, 150
 Alauddin Khilji, 148, 150
 Alexander, 88
 All India Muslim Educational
 Conference, 156
 Ameer Sher Ali Khan, 130
 Amin Khan, 130
 Amir-ul-Mulk, 93, 94
 Amrit Bazar Patrika, the, 151
 Ancient Monuments Preservation
 Act-1904 *See* under Acts
 Anglo-Sikh War, First, 34
 Annexation of, Doab, 34,
 Oudh, 3, 9 Punjab, 128
 Anson, Gen., 16
 Argyll, Duke of, 35
 Arms Act *See* under Acts
 Arya Samaj, 155
 Asoka, 148, 150
 Ata Mohammad Khan, 135
 Auckland, Lord, 41
 Aurangzeb, 148,
 Aurobindo Ghose, 151, 164, 168
 Ayub Khan, 62, 65, 66, 139
 Azam, Mohammed *See* Moham-
 med Azam
 Azam Ullah Khan, 6, 8,
 Azim Khan, 129, 130

B

 Badli-Ki-Sarai, Battle of, 16
 Bahadur Shah-II, 4, 5, 15, 17, 34
 Baji Rao Peshwa-II, 5, 20
 Baker, Col., 56
 Bakht Khan, 16
 Bande Matram, the, 151, 167
 Bannerjee, Surendranath, 160, 163
 Bonnerjee, W.C., 162
 Baring, Sir, 53, 68, 70
 Barindra Ghosh, 152

Barnard, Sir Henry, 16
 Battle of Badli-Ki-Sarai *See*
 Badli-ki-Sarai. Battle of
 Battle of Plassey *See* Plassey.
 Battle of
 Baugh, Lt., 14
 Becons field, Lord 86
 Beadon, Cceil, 32
 Begum of Bhopal *See* under
 Maharajas
 Begum Hazrat *See* Hazrat Begum
 Bengal Rent Act-1859 *See* under
 Acts
 Bentiek, Lord William, 10, 11, 12,
 Blavatsky, Madam, 156
 Blood, Sir Bindon, 94
 Board of Control, 21
 Bose, Khudi Ram, 162
 Boundary Commission, 82
 Brahmo Samaj, 154, 155
 British East India Company *See*
 East India Company
 Bulwar, Edward, 58

C

Caleutta Corporation Act *See*
 under Acts
 Caleutta University Address-1900,
 104
 Campbell, Colin, 21, 29
 Campbell, Gen., 17
 Canning, George, 20
 Canning, Lord, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19,
 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29,
 31, 34, 37, 38, 69, 75, 103,
 129, 135
 Cavagnari, 137
 Cavensgh, Maj. Orfeur, 14
 Chaitanya Mahaprabhu, 156
 Chamberlain, Sir Neville, 33, 136
 Charter Act-1833 *See* under Acts
 Christian Missionaries, 149
 Cornwallis, Lord, 10, 36, 69, 75,
 146
 Council Act *See* under Acts
 Crimean War, 10
 Criminal Law Amendment Act-

Indian *See* under Acts
 Cross, Lord, 87, 89
 Curzon, Lord, 30, 80, 85, 96, 97,
 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103,
 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109,
 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 123,
 125

D

Dalai Lama 101
 Dalhousie, Lord 3, 4, 5, 13, 20, 30,
 31, 49, 58
 Daya Nand Saraswati, Swami 155
 Defence Association 160
 Deo Narain Singh, Raja of Banaras
 125
 Derby, Lord 53
 Dharma Sabha, 154
 Dhingra, Madan Lal 169
 Dinkar Rao, Raja 25
 Disraeli 61, 136
 Doctrine of Lapse 4, 11, 20, 49
 Dost Mohammed 33, 43, 51, 128,
 129
 Douglas, Capt. 15
 Dufferin, Lord 74, 75, 76, 77, 78
 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86,
 87, 88, 90, 140, 141, 162
 Durand Line 92,
 Durand, Sir Mortimer 92, 93
 Durbar of—Agra (1865) 45, Delhi
 (1877) 63, Lahore (1864) 45,
 Banaras 32
 Dutt, A.K., 164
 Dutt, Bhupendra Nath, 168

E

East India Company 19, 21, 22,
 23, 26, 29, 30, 34, 159
 Edon, Ashley 40
 Education Commission, Report of
 72
 Edward VII-King 102, 106, 108,
 122
 Elgin, Lord 15, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40,
 40, 92, 93, 95, 96
 Ellenborough, Lord 5
 Explosive Substances Act *See*
 under Acts

F

- Faiz Mohammad 132
 Famine Commission 68
 Forsyth Douglas 53, 56
 Frere, Sir Bartle 24, 32, 35, 132, 141
 Fuller, Sir Bampfylde 114

G

- Gandhi, Mahatma, 165
 Gaekward, Malhar Rao of Baroda 55
 Gandmak, Treaty of 61, 137
 Gawler, Col. 29
 George V-Emperor, 172
 Ghadar Movement, 172
 Ghose, Aurobindo *See* Aurobindo Ghose
 Ghose, Barindra Kumar 152
 Ghose, Lal Mohan, 161
 Ghulam Haider Khan 66, 93
 Gladstone 53, 58, 65, 66, 86, 87, 89, 92, 93, 142
 Gokhale, Sir G.K. 23, 118, 164, 165
 Government of India Act. 1858
 See under Acts
 Grey, William 35
 Gurukuls 155

H

- Habib-ullah-Khan. 98, 119, 120, 125, 126
 Hamilton, 85
 Hardinge, Lord, 34, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126
 Harington, H.B. 35
 Harington, Marquess of, 70
 Hastings, Lord, 3, 5
 Havellock, 21
 Hazrat Begum, 17
 Hearsey, Gen. 13, 14
 Hume, A.O. 76, 162
 Huns 159

I

- Ilbert Bill *See under Acts*
 India Home Rule Party, 169

- Indian Arms Act *See under Acts*
 Indian Civil Service 26, 34, 72
 Indian Civil Service Act *See under Acts*
 Indian Council Act *See under Acts*
 Indian Criminal Law Amendment Act, *See under Acts*
 Indian National Congress 22, 23, 76, 88, 116, 117, 162
 Indian Patriots Association, 169
 Indian Press 152
 Industrial Revolution 145, 147
 Irwin, Lord 38

J

- Jacob, John 42, 129
 Jenkin, Sir Lawrence, 102
 Jugantar, the 151

K

- Kanwar Singh *See* Singh, Kanwar
 Kesari, the 151, 152,
 Khan Ameer, Sher Ali *See* Ameer Sher Ali Khan
 Khan, Amin *See* Amin Khan,
 Khan, Ata Mohammad *See*
 Ata Mohammad Khan.
 Khan, Ayub *See* Ayub Khan
 Khan, Azam Ullah *See* Azam Ullah Khan
 Khan, Bakht *See* Bakht Khan
 Khan, Ghulam Haider *See* Ghulam Haider Khan
 Khan, Habib Ullah *See* Habib Ullah Khan
 Khan, Syed Ahmed *See* Syed Ahmed Khan
 Khan, Wali Mohammad *See* Wali Mohammad Khan
 Khan, Yaqub *See* Yaqub Khan
 Khan of Khiva 55,
 Khilafat Movement, 172
 Kimberly, Lord, 89
 Kitchner, Lord 110, 113, 116, 122

L

- Laing 32
 Lajpat Rai, Lala 115

Lansdowne Lord 23, 86, 87, 89,
90, 91, 92
Lawrence Lord 33, 34, 35, 36, 37,
38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,
51, 55, 59, 61, 64, 75, 129,
130, 131, 135, 136
Laxmi Bai, Rani of Jhansi 6, 17,
21, 35
Lockhard Sir William 94
Lumsden, Sir Peter 141
Lyall, Sir Alfred 82
Lytton Lord 51, 58, 59, 60, 62, 63,
64, 65, 66, 71, 72, 88, 95, 107
134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139,
141, 160

M

Macaulay Lord 27
Madhuv Rao 55
Magna Carta 159
Mahmud Ghaznavi 159
Maharaja Ranjit Singh *See* Ranjit
Singh, Maharaja
Maharajas of—Bhopal (Begum of)
24, Hyderabad (Nizam of) 24,
109, Karauli (Ruler of) 24,
Patiala (Raja of) 24, 25, Sikkim
(Raja of) 24, Udaipur (Rana
of) 24
Maine Sir Henry
Man Singh 7
Maratha, the 151
Maratha War—Second 4
Masterly Inactivity, Policy of 4,
42
Mayo, Lord 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49,
50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 59,
132, 133
Mehta, Pherozshah, 164
Mehtar, Nizam-ul-Mulk 93
Mersey, Viscount 33, 74, 96
Minto, Lord 4, 12, 111, 112, 113,
114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119,
120, 121, 122
Mirat-ul-Akhbar, the 151
Mohammed Afzal 43, 44
Mohammed Azam 43, 44
Mohammed Faiz *See* Faiz Moha-
ammed

Montgomery, Sir Robert 36
Morley Lord 112, 113, 117, 118,
121, 122
Mullan, mushak-i-Alam 138
Muslim League, 170

N

Nana Saheb 5, 6, 8, 17, 20
Napier, Robert 40
Napoleon 83, 129
Naoroji, Dadabhai, 163, 164, 165
Nasik Conspiracy, 169
Nasirullah 93
News Papers (Incitement to Off-
ences) Act, *See* under Acts
Nicholson 16, 17, 21
Nizam of Hyderabad *See* under
maharajas
Nizam-ul-Mulk Mehtar *See* Mehtar
Nizam-ul-mulk
Northbrook, Lord 44, 53, 54, 55,
56, 57, 58, 59, 63, 68, 133,
134
Nur Mohammed Shah 56, 59, 135

O

Outram, Commander 21, 128

P

Pal, Bipin Chander, 167
Palmerston, Lord 30, 75
Pandey, Mangal 14
Panjab Land Alienation Act-1900
See under Acts
Partition of Bengal—Cancellation
of 123
Peelly, Sir Lewis 55
Penal Code-1837 27
Permanent Land Settlement 36,
76, 146
Plassey, Battle of 13
Prarthana Samaj, 155
Press Act-1908 *See* under Acts
Prevention of Seditious Meetings
Act-1907 *See* under Acts

Prince of Wales, 17
 Princes—Abu Bakar 17, Khair
 Sultan 17 Mirza Mughal 17
 Proclamation of Queen 19, 26, 29,
 159, 160

Q

Queen's Proclamation *See* Procla-
 mation of Queen

R

Railway Board, 107
 Raja of Sikkim *See* under
 Maharajas
 Ram Mohan Roy, Raja, 5, 150,
 151, 154.
 Rama Krishna Mission Movement
 156,
 Rana of Udaipur *See* under
 Maharajas
 Kani Laxmi Bai of Jhansi *See*
 Laxmi Bai, Rani of Jhansi
 Ranjit Singh, Maharaja, 33
 Raza, Syed Hyder *See* Syed Hyder
 Raza
 Reform Act-1909 *See* under Acts
 Ripon, Lord 58, 65, 66, 66, 67, 68,
 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 78,
 79, 81, 85, 88, 138, 139, 140,
 141, 153,
 Ritchie, 32
 Roberts, Gen. 65, 84, 91, 137, 139
 Robertson, T. 107
 Robinson, Earl of Ripon Frederick
 65
 Roos-Keppel, Capt. 102
 Rose, Sir Hugh. 6, 7, 17, 35

S

Sahib Dayal Raja, 74
 Salisbury, Lord. 57, 59, 86, 87,
 88, 91, 93, 96, 134, 136
 Sambad-Kaumudi, the, 151
 Samudragupta 150
 Sandhya, the
 Sati 12

Savarkar, Vinayak Damodar, 169
 Sayaji Rno 55
 Seistan Award 56
 Sen, Keshab Chandra 155
 Shih, Mohammad *See* Mohammad
 Shah
 Shah, Nur Mohammed *See* Nur
 Mohammed Shah
 Shah Shuja 43
 Shah, Syed Ahmed *See* Syed
 Ahmed Shah
 Shah, Wali Mohammed *See* Wali
 Mohammad Shah
 Sher Afzal 94
 Sher Ali 33, 43, 44, 51, 52, 55, 56,
 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 129, 130,
 132, 133, 135, 136, 138, 139
 Sindhia 6
 Singh, Kanwar 8, 17, 20
 Sinha, Lord 118
 Statesman, the 151
 Strachey, Sir John, 38, 63
 Subordinate Isolation, Policy of
 3, 39
 Subsidiary Alliances, 3
 Suez Canal 67
 Syed Ahmed Khan, Sir 157
 Syed Ahmed Shah 33, 56
 Syed Hyder Raza, 169

T

Tagore, Debendranath, 168
 Tania Topc, 6, 7, 17, 35
 Territorial Army, 80
 Theosophical Movement, 156
 Theosophical Society, 169
 Thomas, Lt. Gen., 31
 Times of India, the, 151,
 Tombs, Gen., 41
 Treaty of Gandmak *See* Gandmak
 Treaty
 Trevelyan, Sir Charles, 27, 32,
 35
 Tribune, the, 151
 Trotter, Capt., 45

U

Ullah, Azam Khan *See* Azam
 Ullah Khan
 Ullah, Maulvi Ahmed *See* Ahmed
 Ullah Maulvi
 Umra Khan, 94

V

Vernacular Press Act-1882 *See*
 under Acts
 Viceroy's Council, 22, 113
 Victoria Memorial Hall-1921, 106
 Victoria, Queen, 63, 106, 169
 Vivekananda, Swami, 156, 168

W

Wali Mohammad Khan, 62

Wali Mohammad Shah, 137, 138
 War of Crimea *See* Crimean War
 Wellesley, Lord, 3, 152
 White Mutiny, 30
 White, Sir George, 89
 Wilson, James, 21, 27
 Wingfield, Charles, 38
 Wood, Sir Charles, 25, 28, 38, 53,
 72
 World War-First, 80, 119, 125

Y

Yaqub Khan, 52, 56, 61, 65, 132,
 136, 137
 Young, Col., 101
 Young India Society, the, 169
 Yugantar, the, 168
 Yusuf Khan, 128



Cal
N 5.12.74.

Central Archaeological Library,

NEW DELHI. 46257

Call No. 954.084
132a

Author—Brahma, O P
Singh

Title—History of India
1857-416

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI.

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.